

A LITERARY CRITICAL COMPARISON OF THE MASORETIC TEXT  
AND SEPTUAGINT OF DANIEL 2-7

by

Timothy John Meadowcroft

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Divinity, New College, University of  
Edinburgh, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 1993



I declare that this thesis is my own composition and constitutes the results of my own research.

Timothy John Meadowcroft  
11 June 1993



## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This thesis applies the tools of literary or narrative criticism to a comparison of the Masoretic Text (MT) and Septuagint (G) versions of Daniel 2-7, the chapters which MT preserves in Aramaic. The approach treats both versions as literary creations with their own integrity, as a means of discovering more about both versions, their relationship to one another, and their provenance. The thesis is structured on the premise that chs 2-7 form a chiasm in the Aramaic. Accordingly, the central pair, chs 4-5, is treated first, followed by chs 6 and 3 and finally the outer pair, chs 2 and 7. At each stage, the relationship of the particular story in question to the rest of chs 2-7 is also compared.

As a result of the study three types of conclusion are drawn: literary, thematic and historical. In literary terms, the MT narrator is more covert. As a result motivation and point of view are conveyed in MT by a variety of literary devices including the use of irony, the manipulation of dialogue and deployment of characters in the stories. The more overt G tends to anticipate the story and to attribute motives and emotions to characters. These differences are most acute in Daniel 4 because of the presence of Nebuchadnezzar as first person narrator, but can be observed in all the other narratives of Daniel 2-7. There is greater internal consistency evident in MT, and a greater congruency with other biblical narratives. All of this suggests that MT is a more deliberately crafted form than its G counterpart. There is also literary evidence for a differing structure within the wider narrative unit. MT binds the central pair of stories (chs 4 and 5) together primarily with the common Nebuchadnezzar material. This is not the case in G, where chs 4 and 5 have less in common with one another yet chs 3 and 4 are more closely linked than in MT. This gives some credence to the view that the more chronological chapter order in P967 — chs 7 and 8 between chs 4 and 5 — may have been original to the Old Greek.

Several thematic conclusions arise from the literary analysis. MT's treatment of the interplay between heaven and earth in both story and vision suggests a more sophisticated handling of symbolism, in comparison to the allegorical approach of G. The wisdom of Daniel in MT is more mantic than is the case in the Greek narratives, which prefer to see Daniel more in terms of *Bildungsweisheit*. The view taken of Nebuchadnezzar by G is more negative than in MT, more reminiscent of the attitude toward the evil regime of chs 7-12 and less of the Babylonian / Persian setting conveyed in the Aramaic. As a result, MT is more universalist and G more concerned with Israelite nation and cult. However there are aspects of G that point to much earlier material also.

A tentative historical conclusion is reached that each version reflects a different circle of tradition originating from Persian times, chiefly distinguishable by their views on wisdom and their attitudes to the monarchs encountered by Israel in the diaspora.

The thesis is rounded out by a survey of differences in chs 1 and 8-12 as a check on findings from chs 2-7. One appendix treats Theodotion's translation briefly, and another provides an English translation of the Septuagint of Daniel 2-7.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The principal sources of funding for this thesis have been scholarships from the St Johns College Trust, Auckland, and the New College Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh. In addition, Tyndale House, Cambridge, provided a research grant as well as several weeks residence and study facilities in Cambridge. The F.N. Davey Memorial Trust (SPCK), London, also contributed materially, and the New College Scholarships Committee made it possible for me to attend the 1991 Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense on Daniel at an important stage of my research. I acknowledge all of the above with gratitude. All the faculty in the Department of Hebrew and Old Testament Studies, New College, played a part in encouraging me towards and sustaining me in further studies. I thank especially my two supervisors. Dr Peter Hayman introduced me to the language of Biblical Aramaic in the book of Daniel. His supervision of my work has always been unstinting and meticulously careful. I am grateful for the blend of encouragement and constructive criticism that he mixes. Dr Graeme Auld first opened a door onto the Greek Bible for me, and he too has encouraged me and challenged me throughout this period of study. The staff of the New College Library have been unfailingly friendly and flexible in the help they have provided, and I am much in their debt. I am also grateful for computing help received both from the Faculty of Divinity computing network and from the University Computing Service, often above and beyond the call of duty. My colleagues in Room 68a, formerly the Library Postgraduate Reading Room, have been a ready source of inspiration, fellowship and food, for which I thank them. As far as family is concerned, John and Monica Meadowcroft, my parents, have maintained our affairs in New Zealand and provided much moral support. And I thank them too for arriving for a visit in time to proofread the thesis. Lois and Andrew Young in Edinburgh have given us as a family an enormous amount both materially and emotionally, and we owe them special thanks. My children, Anna, Sarah, Katie and Elizabeth, have made a number of adjustments so that I could study. I thank them for their love and tolerance and for making this experience of mine part of their own. Perhaps one day they might even read the thesis. Above all I honour my wife, Sue. She has worked long hours to make this project possible, and in so doing her love and commitment have never wavered. I will always be grateful to her.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
Limits	8
Literary or historical approaches	9
'Literary' or 'narrative' criticism	12
Form critical considerations	13
The Septuagint as a translation	15
Some important terms	17
Textual witnesses to the Septuagint	21
<b>CHAPTER 2: DANIEL 4</b>	<b>23</b>
Arrangement of material	24
Person of the narrator	26
The narrator in biblical literature	29
The nature of the king's exile	34
Wisdom in Daniel	35
Use of dialogue	37
Symbol or allegory?	41
Symbol and allegory: a distinction	44
Differences in interpretation	45
Differences in the account of the dream	47
Literary merit in the Septuagint	48
Conclusion	49
<b>CHAPTER 3: DANIEL 5</b>	<b>51</b>
Setting	52
The sin of Belshazzar	57
The king's motivation and fate	58
Characters	63
Perspective	68
Narrative and narrator	70
The writing on the wall	72
Words and vision	75
Other literary features	76
Links with Daniel 4	79
Conclusion	81
<b>CHAPTER 4: DANIEL 6</b>	<b>83</b>
Linking of scenes	85
Ascription of motive	88
Narratorial presence	90
Pace	91
Irony in biblical narrative	92
'A cheerful haggadic tone'	93
Parody	96
Dramatic irony	98
The building blocks of irony	101
Perspectives on prayer	101
The divinity of the king	106
Darius and his encyclical	108
The personalizing of Darius	111
The king and Daniel	113

The character of Daniel	113
Idols	114
The trial of Daniel	115
Literary merit in the Septuagint	118
Narrative links with Daniel 4 and 5	119
Thematic links with Daniel 4 and 5	119
Literary links with Daniel 4 and 5	121
Conclusion	123
<b>CHAPTER 5: DANIEL 3</b>	<b>125</b>
The Additions: narrative insertions?	127
The Additions as part of the narrative	131
Differing interests of the Additions	132
Narrative shape	134
Narrative perspective	138
The repeated lists	140
Repetition of the lists as comedy	144
Repetition of phrases	146
Setting of the story	149
Other literary devices	152
Theological differences	154
Narrative links with Daniel 4-6	160
Literary links with Daniel 4-6	161
Thematic links with Daniel 4-6	162
Septuagint links with Daniel 4	163
Conclusion	165
<b>CHAPTER 6: DANIEL 2</b>	<b>168</b>
Verses 13-23: inserted material?	169
The song of praise as insert	175
Narrative structure	181
Irony and ambiguity	182
Point of view	184
Narratorial stance	191
Literary devices	192
Interpretation of the dream	193
Differences in theological outlook	197
Differing traditions about Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar	200
Differing historical backgrounds	204
Conclusion: links with Daniel 3-6	207
<b>CHAPTER 7: DANIEL 7</b>	<b>210</b>
Ancient of Days in the Masoretic Text	212
Son of man in the Masoretic Text	213
Holy ones of the Most High in the Masoretic Text	215
Daniel 7: coherent and consistent?	217
Narrative structure	220
A further literary note	225
The character of Daniel	226
Vision and interpretation: insignificant differences	228
Verses 26f: further insignificant differences	230
Differences in understanding of the four beasts	234
Differences in understanding of the son of man	237
Differences in understanding of the holy ones	245
Links with other stories: Daniel the visionary	250
Links with other stories: bestiality / humanity theme	251
Links with other stories: four empires theme	253

Links with other stories: the final kingdom	256
Further literary links with other stories	257
Structural links with other stories	258
Conclusion	259
<b>CHAPTER 8: DIFFERENCES IN DANIEL 1 AND 8-12</b>	<b>262</b>
The nature of the translation	263
Translations of particular words	267
Differing traditions represented in the Septuagint?	268
Translation of key terms	269
Treatment of people	272
Treatment of geographical terms	274
The daughter	276
Dating in 9.24-27	277
Conclusion	279
<b>CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSION</b>	<b>281</b>
Reasons for variations	281
Narrative technique	283
Narrative structure	285
Literary merit in the Septuagint	286
The symbolic	286
Wisdom	288
Theological or political concerns	291
Text historical questions	293
Prospects	297
<b>APPENDIX 1: THEODOTION</b>	<b>302</b>
Daniel 2	302
Daniel 3	304
Daniel 4	308
Daniel 5	309
Daniel 6	310
Daniel 7	311
<b>APPENDIX 2: SEPTUAGINT DANIEL 2-7 IN ENGLISH</b>	<b>313</b>
Daniel 2	313
Daniel 3	318
Daniel 4	326
Daniel 5	330
Daniel 6	332
Daniel 7	335
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>338</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BDB</i>	<i>Brown, Driver, Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon</i>
<i>BH</i>	<i>Biblical Hebrew</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
<i>BM</i>	<i>Beth Mikra</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
<i>B.Talmud</i>	<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CD</i>	<i>Cairo Genizah text of the Damascus Document</i>
<i>CSR</i>	<i>Christian Scholars Review</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>The Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPA</i>	<i>Jewish Palestinian Aramaic</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LV</i>	<i>Lumière et Vie</i>
<i>MT</i>	<i>Masoretic Text</i>
<i>NEB</i>	<i>New English Bible</i>
<i>NLH</i>	<i>New Literary History</i>
<i>NRT</i>	<i>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
<i>OG</i>	<i>Old Greek</i>
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i>
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>PSBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology</i>
<i>PT</i>	<i>Poetics Today</i>
<i>P967</i>	<i>Chester Beatty Papyrus 967</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RelSt</i>	<i>Religious Studies</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions</i>
<i>RR</i>	<i>Reformed Review</i>
<i>RSV</i>	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
<i>Sef</i>	<i>Sefarad</i>
<i>Syh</i>	<i>Codex Syro-hexaplaris</i>
<i>TCAAS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences</i>

<i>Them</i>	<i>Themelios</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTs</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum Supplement</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>The Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenland Gesellschaft</i>
Ⓢ	Septuagint
Ⓣ	Theodotion
1QGenAp	Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1
1QM	War Scroll from Qumran Cave 1
1QpHab	Pesher on Habakkuk from Qumran Cave 1
1QS	Community Rule from Qumran Cave 1
4Q246	'Son of God' fragment from Qumran Cave 4
4QprEsthar	Proto-Esther fragments from Qumran Cave 4
4QPrNab	Prayer of Nabonidus from Qumran Cave 4
11QMelch	Melchizedek text from Qumran Cave 11
88	Chigi manuscript R.vii.45

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

One of the challenges of the book of Daniel is that the Septuagint (Θ) version of the book, diverges from the Masoretic Text (MT) in significant ways, especially, but not only, in chs 3-6. At the same time, another version known as Theodotion (Θ) has become the well known and better attested Greek version of Daniel. Neither of these phenomena on their own are unique in the Greek Bible. The apparent freedom of the translators of Job or Proverbs is well known, as are the substantial differences in length of other texts, such as Jeremiah and portions of the former prophets.<sup>1</sup> The presence of a differing Greek tradition is also a feature of the history of the book of Esther.<sup>2</sup> What is unique about the Greek translation of Daniel is that somewhere in the history of the Greek Bible the Septuagint of Daniel was replaced by Theodotion, which is much closer to MT, as the authoritative Greek version.

How and why this situation came about is uncertain. What can be determined is that the two Greek versions jostled with each other for many years from possibly early first century BCE until at least the time of Origen, who was aware of both.<sup>3</sup> By then Theodotion was the Greek text

---

<sup>1</sup>Jellicoe, *The Septuagint*, 316ff

<sup>2</sup>Jellicoe, *The Septuagint*, 68

<sup>3</sup>See the summaries on Theodotion in Würthwein, 54f, and Jellicoe, *The Septuagint*, 83ff. Charles, *Revelation*, lxxxf, demonstrates the presence of both Θ and Θ influence in Revelation. Beale, 'A Reconsideration', 540f, and Trudinger, 83, argue that there is more Θ and less Θ in Revelation than Charles has allowed for. See also the summary of Hartman and DiLella, 76ff. Behind this lies a wider debate on the relationship



of Daniel favoured by Christians. Jewish opinion during the period in question is less accessible, since by the stage that Daniel was accepted into the Jewish canon, greater authority was attributed by Jews to the original Semitic languages of Scripture.

My purpose in this dissertation is to explore the curious situation outlined above by applying the tools of literary criticism to a comparison of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Daniel 2-7. I will do this by comparing the versions of each chapter first as discrete narratives. For form critical reasons which are spelled out in more detail below I work with the chapters in the following order: 4, 5, 6, 3, 2 and 7. At each stage the links with stories already treated in each version will be explored, so gradually building up a picture of MT and  $\Theta$ , both as collections of individual narratives and also as larger literary units. Finally I will undertake a brief survey of the differences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew chapters 1 and 8-12 as a check on the trends detected in chs 2-7. Two appendices supplement the argument. The first contains a survey of characteristics of Theodotion for each chapter, although that version also receives regular mention in the main body of the thesis. The second appendix provides a literal English translation of the Septuagint in Rahlfs' edition. When I quote the Septuagint in English I quote from the translation of Appendix 2.

The literary approach as outlined yields results that are both literary and historical. We will see that the two versions differ markedly in the way they tell their stories as well as in the concerns that motivate them, and in the process we will gain further insight into the nature of biblical narrative and the quality of the work that resulted in the Masoretic Text of Daniel.

We will also find that some light has been shed on the historical puzzles posed by these texts. The historical evidence is tantalizing for

---

of Theodotion to the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon$  recension identified by Barthélemy. See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 147ff. Jellicoe, 'Some Reflections', 24, prefers Ur-Theodotion as an explanation of early witnesses to  $\Theta$ . Schmitt, 12ff, also differs with Barthélemy and one of Barthélemy's supporters, Busto Saiz, 43ff.

the student in that at one point it suggests a Septuagint which is later than the Masoretic Text while at another the position is reversed. Gradually a picture emerges into focus of differing, if not competing, wisdom circles witnessed to by the two versions of Daniel 2-7 under scrutiny. These divergent outlooks, possibly originating as early as the Persian period, are hinted at by such things as the way the different kings are viewed, how Daniel and his friends are understood, the use made of symbols, and the picture painted of the interaction between heaven and earth.

The exact structure of each chapter of the thesis will be determined by the literary form and content of the story being treated, but certain topics will recur regularly. Narrative features, such as the use of dialogue, the stance of the narrator, manipulation of perspective, and the employment of phrases or words or syntactic structures for thematic purposes, are normally treated first.<sup>4</sup> Then follows a discussion of differences in content between the versions, such as attitudes towards wisdom and the gentile kings. It is there that some of the historical issues begin to emerge. In the context of my treatment of Daniel 4, the first story dealt with, I pause several times to discuss issues or define terms which are germane to the thesis as a whole. But before then, the remainder of this introductory section is devoted to some methodological questions raised above, and to further matters of terminology.

### limits

There are a number of fields of study upon which this thesis will impinge that can only be alluded to. The border drawn between them and a literary critical comparison of Daniel 2-7 is arbitrary, but necessary to keep the discussion to manageable proportions. For example I do not deal in depth with Theodotion, because its closeness to the Masoretic Text means that there are few differences of narrative consequence. I do not explore the textual issues in either version to the depth which they

---

<sup>4</sup>The position of the narrator within his narration affects the reader's perception of the story. The word 'stance' pertains to that position adopted by the narrator. See Lanser, 9, on stance.

demand, as a necessary supplement to the literary criticism. The work of others on the nature of the Septuagint as translation is drawn on but not added to. The differences between versions in the way symbolism is handled call for a more comprehensive treatment of the relationship of texts to meaning. Most obviously, the links in the book of Daniel across all the form divisions make it clear that any treatment of less than all 12 chapters (14 if Susanna and Bel and the Dragon are included) is incomplete. I acknowledge all these areas, but am not able to include their treatment amongst the purposes of the present discussion.

### **literary or historical approaches**

In undertaking a literary study I use the word 'literary' as the adjective from the noun 'literature', and do not intend it to denote the study of sources and 'history of literature', an earlier usage in biblical criticism.<sup>5</sup> Such an approach takes the Septuagint seriously both as a literary creation with its own integrity, and as a collection of writings that at some stage has possibly been accorded authoritative status. The Septuagint, particularly in Daniel, has often been treated simply as a mine of historical critical information to be quarried in assessing the Masoretic Text. The results can be a confusing plethora of detail pointing in no direction and many directions at once. By approaching the text from the literary end of the literary / historical axis I seek to discover more about  $\Theta$  and its relationship to the Masoretic Text, and about the world behind both versions.<sup>6</sup> To put it another way, textual criticism is a servant of the literary study, rather than the reverse. Fewell, in introducing her literary reading of Daniel 1-6 MT, points to such an approach to the Greek versions of the same stories as potentially 'an interesting and helpful study'.<sup>7</sup> In adopting this particular approach I do not deny the validity of other encounters

---

<sup>5</sup>See Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, 20ff and 154ff, for a discussion of the difference.

<sup>6</sup>Long, in his introduction to *Images*, 7, speaks of de-emphasizing more usual 'philological and historical concerns' in order to highlight the material 'as story'.

<sup>7</sup>Fewell, 9

with the text from different angles.

The application of literary criteria to scriptural material raises large questions about the respective natures of literature and sacred texts, and the relationship between the two.<sup>8</sup> Without attempting to address those issues in a formal way, the 'literary' approach of this dissertation displays two chief characteristics. Firstly, it deals primarily with the received forms of the versions as we have them in G and MT, although of course issues of composition history must impinge on that approach in places. The manner in which the stories relate to one another is part of that consideration of the received form. Secondly, it seeks to appreciate such things as 'the beauty of the text, the narrative and poetic skill of its writers, and the richness of metaphor and other figurative language which it contains'.<sup>9</sup> However the versions of Daniel came to be, and whatever the intentions of those involved with their compilation and creation, they contain stories that can be appreciated as literary creations within a collection that owes something of its shape to literary craftsmanship.

In a sense what I am doing is a denial of Westcott and Hort's famous dictum, '...final decision on documents should precede final decision on readings'.<sup>10</sup> An opposite perspective could be that literary texts should not be asked to answer the historical questions that have dominated biblical criticism.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the only questions that ought to be asked of texts are those concerning their literary form. There is something of such a reaction against a historicist attitude towards the Septuagint in my own approach. But I also take the view expressed by Thompson that historiographical reconstruction and literary

---

<sup>8</sup>For a helpful summary, see Coggins, 12ff.

<sup>9</sup>Coggins, 13

<sup>10</sup>Cited in Cowe, 59.

<sup>11</sup>Sternberg, *Poetics*, 13, reacts against 'the excesses and fruitlessness of traditional source criticism' but warns against ignoring the data it provides. See Long, 'The "New" Biblical Poetics', 79ff, on the attitudes of Sternberg and Alter in this field.

interpretation should be inseparable.<sup>12</sup> Just as text reconstruction is sometimes a necessary precursor to literary appreciation, so at times a literary approach can point beyond the immediate questions to the history of the texts.

As far as Septuagint studies are concerned, the historical / literary debate is epitomized in the Joint Research Venture undertaken by Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust and Tov, which resulted in *The Story of David and Goliath*. In their debate over methodology, Barthélemy and Gooding who hold to the priority of MT allow the literary study to feed into their textual work on 1 Samuel 16-18, while Lust and Tov for the priority of *Ḥ* insist that the more objective work of textual criticism must be done first, and allowed to inform the literary study.<sup>13</sup> More recently Auld and Ho return to the same discussion, and attempt to show a way through the impasse encountered by the Joint Venture scholars by arguing that the Masoretic Text is 'the recomposition of an original story'.<sup>14</sup> They affirm the methodological views of Lust, but at the same time espouse a position in favour of the priority of the Septuagint that is highly dependent on literary considerations.<sup>15</sup> This unfinished debate demonstrates Thompson's views on the dependence on one another of the literary and historical.

The work of Clines in *The Esther Scroll* is a widely lauded example of scholarship which holds the two aspects together. He compares the Masoretic Text of Esther with the two Greek versions of the book, one similar to MT and one significantly different. His method combines a comparative literary appreciation of the three versions with source

---

<sup>12</sup>These are the terms used by Thompson, 39. See also the discussion by Longman, 49ff, on the strengths and weaknesses of literary approaches.

<sup>13</sup>See Lust in *The Story of David and Goliath*, 121ff, on the methodological issues.

<sup>14</sup>Auld and Ho, 24

<sup>15</sup>Auld and Ho, 24 and 38, ask 'What about literary creation by a redactor out of existing material in 1 Samuel?' and partly conclude that their approach 'explains the literary function of all the major MT pluses...', and takes account of 'the artistic quality of the MT story'.

critical work, in order to reach conclusions about how the canonical text of Esther was built up.<sup>16</sup> I have been influenced by Clines' approach, but place a stronger emphasis on the literary side of the equation, and am less interested in the search for a sequence of stories.<sup>17</sup> As a result my historical conclusions are more to do with the background to the versions than with a detailed picture of the composition of the texts.

### **'literary' or 'narrative' criticism**

In recent times a discipline known as 'narrative criticism' has been identified and begun to be codified. It is important to be clear what is meant by 'narrative criticism' as opposed to 'literary criticism'. Confusion arises because in one sense the 'narrative' may be thought of as only one aspect of the many that together form a 'literary' entity. In that respect, my work is literary because the narrative shape and the role of the narrator in the story are not the only concerns treated, even if they do form a major part. I have chosen to use the phrase 'literary criticism' in the title to avoid the suggestion that I do not also deal with matters such as plot, characterization, theme and pace. However, the present study owes much to the categories identified by Powell as central to the narrative critical approach, and they go beyond the simple study of narrative aspects as part of the literary craft.<sup>18</sup> The starting point provided by narrative criticism also leads into treatment of other aspects of the story. In particular, because the operation of point of view is so important to an appreciation of the particular stories in question, the concept of an implied reader and an implied narrator within

---

<sup>16</sup>Clines, 15, says that 'we should first attempt to seize the narrative shape and direction before asking what purpose the narrative shaped in this way may be supposed to have served. The literary question must precede the historical.' Compare another recent treatment of Esther by Fox, 6 and 127ff, whose work is centred on the redactional process and whose tools are source and redaction criticism. His literary treatment of the texts is secondary.

<sup>17</sup>Contrast Wills, 87, whose approach to Daniel 4-6 and Bel and the Dragon relies on genre distinction in order to identify stages in the redaction of the stories. Within this limited range of chapters, he builds a detailed picture of the layers of tradition that are evident in them.

<sup>18</sup>Powell, 36ff



the text informs much of what I do.<sup>19</sup> So this thesis could accurately be called 'narrative critical' in concern, were it not for problems of definition created by such a description.

At the same time I acknowledge the work of a number of diverse authors, such as Sternberg, Bar-Efrat, Berlin and Alter, who undertake a treatment of what they generally call biblical narrative. They do not appear to be self-consciously members of a 'narrative criticism' school yet their central concern as espoused in the titles of their books is with the narrative.<sup>20</sup> What they mean by narrative is clearly wider than one aspect of a literary treatment. My indebtedness to their insights is another reason why the use of the phrase 'narrative criticism' would be inappropriate for this thesis. It should be noted that most of the work of such critics has been done with the pentateuchal and historical narratives of the Hebrew Bible, and very little in texts such as Daniel.

#### **form critical considerations**

Any work on the stories of Daniel and his friends must first define the boundaries of the text. Some deal with the Aramaic stories (2-6), some deal with all the stories (1-6), some treat the Aramaic chapters (2-7), and a few work with chs 1-7. I have chosen to treat chs 2-7 for various form critical reasons. They are taken largely from the work of others and are by no means definitive, but they do provide a necessary way into the present study. The most obvious reason is that those chapters constitute the Aramaic material in the Masoretic Text, but there are other factors which complement that reason.

One such factor is that there are strong echoes in ch 7 of material that precedes it. To leave off before the first vision would be to leave

---

<sup>19</sup>Powell, 19

<sup>20</sup>Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*; Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*; Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*; Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*.

the tale partly untold.<sup>21</sup> At the same time, there is some evidence that chs 8-12 are a development of ch 7 and therefore in some sense separate from it, although an exploration of that issue is beyond the scope of this thesis.<sup>22</sup> The affinity of ch 7 with the other Aramaic material in Daniel suggests that 2-7 can be treated as a unit. That leaves the question of what to do with ch 1, which is not in Aramaic but is a story rather than a vision. It is commonly accepted that the Aramaic material of 2-7 was subsequently redacted into the Hebrew framework, which places ch 1 as a later introduction to the final form of the book.<sup>23</sup> It is on the basis of that form critical judgement that I have left ch 1 out of consideration.

An influential point of view on the structure of chs 2-7 in the Masoretic Text has been that of Lenglet. He argues that the Aramaic stories are arranged as a chiasm with 4-5 as the central pairing. Beyond this are chs 3 and 6 as mirrors of each other in the chiasm, and 3-6 together are flanked by chs 2 and 7.<sup>24</sup> A number of literary factors also emerge during the course of the thesis in support of Lenglet's view.<sup>25</sup> The chiastic structure informs the order in which I treat the narratives, beginning at the centre and moving outwards, without denying that there

---

<sup>21</sup>Fewell and Wills provide examples of treatments which end at ch 6.

<sup>22</sup>See for example Montgomery, *Daniel*, 325ff, or Dequeker, 109. The distinction is as much literary as historical. Contrast Rowley, 'The Unity of the Book of Daniel', 249f, for whom chs 7 and 8 are closely bound together. At the same time he sees 8-12 as from a single hand.

<sup>23</sup>Miller, 115ff, treats ch 1 as part of a Hebrew collection distinct from the Aramaic Daniel collection. Gammie, 'The Classification', 195, also accepts an early form of chs 2-7 as a distinct unit. See also the conclusion of David, 396, on ch 1 as the work of a Maccabean editor. Baldwin, 154, argues from a quite different perspective that chs 2-7 are 'the nucleus of the book'.

<sup>24</sup>Lenglet, 170ff

<sup>25</sup>Some genre analyses support this structure by linking chs 4 and 5 and chs 3 and 6 by a shared genre. That analysis also has the effect of distinguishing the pairs from each other. See for example the distinction of Humphreys, 217f, between court contest and court conflict, and of Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 338ff, between *Märchen* ('fairy tale') and *Legende* ('legend'). But these distinctions must be treated with caution.



is also a progression between the chapters.<sup>26</sup>

### the Septuagint as a translation

Wherever a difference between the versions occurs, a fundamental but complex historical question arises. Does the variant represent a *Vorlage* different from MT, or did it come about in the course of translation? To the extent that this dissertation is interested in the literary form of the Septuagint regardless of how it came to be, the question is not relevant. But since an awareness of the theological and political interests of each version is part and parcel of the literary study, it is necessary to be conscious of the different levels at which divergence could have occurred without necessarily being able to identify the reason for each one. I do not set out to produce a comprehensive treatment of every difference, but an awareness of the possibilities is an important part of the backdrop to this study.<sup>27</sup>

It has been amply demonstrated that the ancients were aware of the distinction between free and literal translation.<sup>28</sup> The Septuagint has been reckoned to occupy various positions on the free / literal spectrum in different books. The Pentateuch is thought of as the most literal and the opposite end of the range is reckoned to be occupied by various writings, such as Job or Proverbs.<sup>29</sup> In the wake of a number of studies of translation technique in the Septuagint, some doubt is cast on the

---

<sup>26</sup>Good, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy', 66, warns that the presence of a chiasmic structure in MT should not blind us to the progression between chapters as they now stand.

<sup>27</sup>Jeansonne's study of chs 7-12 is an example of one who does engage in such a comprehensive treatment. See also the unpublished Ph.D. thesis by D.O. Wenthe, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1-6* (Notre Dame University, 1991). This work came to hand too late to be incorporated into my research, but note Wenthe's conclusion (p 247) that 'the OG can be favorably compared with Theodotion in terms of fidelity'.

<sup>28</sup>See for example Brock, 'The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation', 555f.

<sup>29</sup>This relates to the thesis that earlier translations formed a Greek tradition that informed later translation. See Seeligmann, 46, on the Septuagint of Isaiah influencing the translator of Daniel. See also Hanhart, 363, and Rabin, 22, on the influence of the Greek Pentateuch.

usefulness of the distinction between free and literal translation. Instead, it is now argued that the  $\Theta$  translator is always literal in intent, but in varying degrees.<sup>30</sup> As such his version deserves to be taken seriously as a reliable witness to his *Vorlage*.<sup>31</sup>

One early translator from Hebrew into Greek who articulated his thoughts on translation was the grandson of Sirach.<sup>32</sup> He acknowledges that his grandfather's work is different in kind from 'the law and the prophets and the rest of the books' (Sir Prol 24f, ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ βιβλίων), but still struggles to find precise equivalents in the Greek. He laments his own imprecision in the face of a requirement of great precision (Sir Prol 20) by setting the verbs ἀδυναμέω and ἰσοδυναμέω against one another.<sup>33</sup> How important then must an accurate translation even of the writings have been? It seems inherently unlikely therefore that the Septuagintal translator of Daniel would have been translating an MT-like *Vorlage* at points where the versions diverge substantially.

Wright's work on the parent text of Sirach has provided us with a modern piece of research to back up that supposition. He begins with the assertion of Barr that the Septuagint is a literal translation, and takes up the aspects of literalism defined by Barr and Tov.<sup>34</sup> From there he does a computer-based comparison of several indicators of literalness in different biblical books of the Septuagint, as a lead in to his work on

---

<sup>30</sup>Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 281ff, has been especially influential. Others to note are Hanhart, 342, and Aejmelaeus, 'Septuagintal Translation Techniques', 381. Tov has also worked extensively in this area. See for example his 'Loan Words', 'Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand?', and 'Three Dimensions' articles.

<sup>31</sup>Note also the argument of Ulrich, 'The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran', 65, that findings at Qumran confirm the importance of the Septuagint as a faithful witness.

<sup>32</sup>See Brock, 'The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation', 555, on Sirach.

<sup>33</sup>His lament is rounded out with the advice that could well be heeded by moderns: read it in the original.

<sup>34</sup>Wright, 27 and 270n, draws on Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 281ff, and Tov, *The Septuagint*, 53ff.

Ben Sira. His measure of word-order variations is of particular interest to us because it embraces the whole of the Old Testament including both Daniel 9 and Daniel 11. Wright measures the percentage variation of word order between the translation and its original, both including and excluding the particle *δέ*. In the inclusive measure the most literal books in terms of word order are Song of Songs and Qohelet, with a variation of under 0.1%. Esther, Proverbs and Job, all in the 7-12% range, show the greatest variation. Daniel 11 shows a variation in word order of 2.16%, which is less than books such as Exodus, Genesis and Isaiah, and not very different from Leviticus.<sup>35</sup> While this measure is a crude and limited one, it is a further indicator that 11 Daniel provides a literal translation of the material in its *Vorlage*.<sup>36</sup>

This has a couple of consequences for the comparison I am undertaking. It suggests that the Septuagint, for all its apparent freedom in parts, is the work of a translator rather than a redactor. It also allows for the assumption that substantial pluses or minuses in the Greek reflect a different *Vorlage*. It does not deny, though, that the Septuagintal translator conveys something of his own understanding and interests within the constraints of his search for a literal equivalent. Sometimes this comes through in a conscious attempt to clarify the original text, sometimes it is evident in an unconscious choice of synonyms, and sometimes his choice reflects the translation tradition in which he stands. While care will be taken not to read more into the text than is there, this thesis will be alert to differences that have more than technical significance.<sup>37</sup>

#### some important terms

When wisdom in the book of Daniel is discussed a distinction is

---

<sup>35</sup>See Wright, 43-54, especially the tables on pages 46ff.

<sup>36</sup>Wright, 33, himself cautions on the limitations of a statistical study.

<sup>37</sup>Seeligmann, 8, cautions against 'overrating the extent and importance of intentional changes in the text, and underestimating the part that accident may have played ... in the vicissitudes leading to (the text's) final version'.

often made between 'mantic' and 'aphoristic' or 'logoic' wisdom.<sup>38</sup> Mantic wisdom seeks to divine the future or is dependent on external or divine revelation for its operation. Aphoristic wisdom refers to such things as wise judgement and the exercise of statecraft. Müller expresses the difference with the terms 'mantische Weisheit' and 'Bildungsweisheit'.<sup>39</sup> He argues that both types of wisdom were exercised in Israel. Indeed they were combined in the person of Joseph.<sup>40</sup> However it is described, the distinction is reasonably clear.

Nevertheless, there is a problem in applying the term 'mantic' to Jewish wisdom, as biblical reference to it is at best ambivalent. The family of Greek words related to *μαντεία* almost inevitably translates קסם or one of its cognate forms (Ez 13.8 where *חזה* is so represented is the sole exception). Sometimes the 'divination', as RSV normally translates the term, is explicitly forbidden (Num 23.23 and Dt 18.10). Often it is accompanied by unflattering adjectives, such as 'worthless' or 'false' (Jer 14.14 and Ez 21.23). Only on one occasion in the Hebrew scriptures is קסם used in an unreservedly positive sense. That is at Pr 16.10 where the king is said to possess קסם. Yet there is also a strand that suggests some ambiguity about the term. The most famous instance is the story of Saul's encounter with the medium at Endor in 1 Sam 28.8ff. In response to Saul's command to her to 'divine for me' (קסומי-נא לי), the medium called up the spirit of Samuel which produced a word from the Lord that is unquestioned by the narrative. In some of the prophets, the 'diviners' are figures in Israel who exercise a harmful ministry, but there is a hint that it need not be so (for example Mic 3.7-11). In Jeremiah's letter to the remaining elders of Jerusalem 'your prophets' (Jer 29/36.8, נביאים) are spoken of in the same breath as 'your diviners' (קסמים).

---

<sup>38</sup>See for example Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 189ff. See also the extended discussion by Vanderkam 52ff, on mantic divination and Jewish apocalypticism.

<sup>39</sup>Müller, 'Mantische Weisheit', 271ff etc. See also Wills, 80, who speaks of courtly wisdom (in chs 3 and 6) and mantic wisdom (in chs 2, 4 and 5).

<sup>40</sup>Müller, 'Mantische Weisheit', 274f

The generally negative view of wisdom that is described as 'mantic', if not of the function itself, means that the wisdom of Daniel ideally ought not to be so described. To a certain extent it has been imposed by the secondary literature. Nevertheless, it serves a useful function, and a more neutral alternative does not appear to be available to us. At the same time, it does express what seems to be the MT understanding of Daniel's function as not so very different in kind from that of his Babylonian counterparts. Accordingly, I follow the lead of others in using 'mantic' to describe a type of Israelite wisdom, but with caution.

A number of genre analyses have been applied to Daniel in recent times, most of which have some problems.<sup>41</sup> Milne has applied morphological categories to the stories with limited success, the influential distinction made by Humphreys between court conflict and contest breaks down at some points under literary analysis, and Müller's delineations are heavily dependent on his historical approach to the texts.<sup>42</sup> Sometimes also assumptions about genre can limit the literary analysis, as will become clear at one or two points in our discussion of the texts. Consequently I do not seek to provide well defined genre classifications for each story where others have tried and failed to agree.<sup>43</sup> I do however work with an awareness that the stories differ from one another, and that the differences may at least partly be understood in terms of genre.

The description of material in either of the versions as 'plus' or 'minus' will be employed as a shorthand way of denoting text in one version that is absent in the other. The terms should not be taken to imply any views on the priority of one of the versions over another.

---

<sup>41</sup>See the summary of Wills, 3ff, and the discussion in Gammie, 'The Classification', 192, on sub-genres within what he terms the 'composite literary genre' of apocalyptic literature.

<sup>42</sup>See Milne, 126ff, on the difficulties in agreeing on morphological functions in the Daniel stories. See Humphreys, 217f, on court contest and conflict, and Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 338f. Note also Niditch and Doran, 180, on the literary type of the story in Daniel 2.

<sup>43</sup>Longman, 81, while stressing the importance of genre identification, warns against pigeon-holing texts.

Reference to the translator in the third person singular is another shorthand usage which does not address the question of how many people worked on the Septuagint translation of Daniel 2-7. There may have been one translator or many separate ones, or the translation may have been the result of the activity of a school. For ease of expression, all the possibilities are present in the term 'the translator'.

The historicity or otherwise of the book of Daniel is not a subject of this thesis. Reference to events in the lives of Daniel and his companions as 'stories' is not intended as a judgement on that particular issue. A story is simply a crafted account of events.<sup>44</sup> I use 'story' roughly synonymously with 'narrative', although ch 7 also proves to be a narrative of sorts whereas stories are distinguished from visions.

The 'Old Greek' is not quite the same thing as the 'Septuagint'. Jeansonne defines the Old Greek as 'the oldest recoverable form of the first translation into Greek' of the Semitic texts.<sup>45</sup> The Septuagint as we have it is largely based on the Old Greek but also has its own transmission history. The two terms can be used synonymously, but there are times when a distinction must be preserved.

There is considerable diversity in the way the terms 'version', 'revision' and 'recension' are used. I refer throughout to both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint as 'versions' rather than 'revisions' or 'recensions'. I base my usage on Würthwein who says that a version is a translation from another language, whereas a recension is a revision of a previously translated version.<sup>46</sup> I suspect that he uses the word 'recension' synonymously with 'revision'. The key distinction is between

---

<sup>44</sup>See the discussion of Moberly, *From Eden to Golgotha*, 113ff, on 'story, history and truth' in the Old Testament.

<sup>45</sup>Jeansonne, 8

<sup>46</sup>Würthwein, 49 and 57. But contrast Jellicoe in *The Septuagint*, who seems to understand revision and recension in different ways but never defines exactly how.



'version' and 'recension / revision'.<sup>47</sup> It is clear that  $\Theta$  can be spoken of as a version. However, if a version is a translation then the Masoretic Text cannot be so described. At that point I take refuge in non-technical English usage where a version can be a variant or a form of something else. In that respect, MT and  $\Theta$  are both versions, in that they are both variations on a common tradition. So 'version' functions as a useful generic term which includes MT and  $\Theta$  for the purposes of my argument.

### textual witnesses to the Septuagint

Because the Septuagint of Daniel was eclipsed so early in the present era, there are only three manuscript witnesses to it. The first is manuscript R vii.45 in the Chigi library in Rome, known to us as 88, according to the manuscript numbering system of Göttingen (87 according to Field and Swete). Other evidence is in the Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus, a Syriac translation of the Hexaplaric Greek, preserving the asterisks and obeli of Origen. This is referred to as Syh. Largely confirming the Chigi manuscript 88 is the Chester Beatty Papyrus known as 967.<sup>48</sup> Daniel is incomplete in P967, but since the work of Geissen and Hamm on the portions at Cologne there is much more available than there used to be. The ordering of chapters in the Chester Beatty Papyrus differs from the other witnesses in that chs 7 and 8 appear between chs 4 and 5, a fact that has some bearing on the discussion that follows.

The two major modern editions of the Septuagint of Daniel are contained in Rahlfs and the volume edited by Ziegler in the Göttingen project. Both present the Septuagint and Theodotion in parallel to one another. Unless indicated otherwise, the Rahlfs edition is the basis of what follows in the main body of the thesis as well as the translation of Appendix 2. Differences between the two editions are noted where

---

<sup>47</sup>In light of this distinction, there is obviously debate over whether  $\Theta$  is a version in its own right or a revision. See Würthwein, 54. For convenience I refer to  $\Theta$  as a version.

<sup>48</sup>Kenyon, xi

appropriate. Most disagreements arise from the availability to Ziegler of Kenyon's earlier less complete edition of P967. Although Göttingen tends to be reasonably eclectic, it shows a bias towards P967. Since Ziegler did his work on the Göttingen edition (1954), the Cologne portions of the papyrus have become available and there are points in the text at which I accept the Cologne witness of P967 against both Rahlfs and Göttingen. The Septuagint versification in Rahlfs is the one that I shall observe. Where this differs from the Masoretic Text both options will be cited unless it is plain from the context that the reference is to one version in particular.



## CHAPTER TWO

### DANIEL 4

Apart from form critical considerations, the story of Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great tree (3.31-4.34 in MT, 4.1-37 in Rahlfs' edition of both Greek versions) is a good place to begin the literary comparison, because the greatest surface divergence between the Masoretic Text and the Old Greek in Daniel 2-7 is found in this story. A comparison of the two accounts reveals a number of literary and theological points that will recur in our study of other chapters in Daniel.

MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  tell the same story to markedly different effect and for different purposes. I begin with a look at the different ways in which each version of the story arranges its material and, as part of that, the different characterization of Daniel. From there I consider narrative person and the use of dialogue, and how these aspects affect point of view.<sup>1</sup> Relevant to that part of the argument is a consideration of the events that lie behind the tradition. I then explore the difference between symbol and allegory with respect to the two stories. In doing so I notice variations in the way the myth of the great tree is applied, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Stanzel, 9, identifies two overlapping functions of point of view or viewpoint. One denotes the attitude of a narrator or character towards a question. The other concerns the standpoint from which a story is narrated. Lanser, 18, expresses the concept similarly when she says point of view combines ideology and technique. While the complexities of some modern analyses of point of view in a text, such as that by Lotman, are not so applicable to biblical narrative, the different aspects highlighted by Lanser and Stanzel are borne in mind by the present treatment. I employ the word 'perspective' almost synonymously with point of view, but with a tendency to use it more to denote standpoint, Stanzel's second function of point of view.

additions to the telling and the application on the part of the Septuagint version. The discussion ends with a comment on literary merit in the Septuagint version.

On occasions in this chapter, I pause to consider issues that have some application to the immediate context of Daniel 4 but are also foundational to the thesis as a whole. The first of these looks at literary questions concerning the place and function of the narrator in biblical narrative, his reliability or otherwise, the extent of his knowledge, his relationship to the implied author, and the relationship between God and the narrator. These are matters particularly highlighted by the use of a first person narrator in ch 4. The second cluster of questions is theological or thematic and relates to the different types of wisdom evident in the versions of the Daniel stories. It contains such topics as the distinction between allegory and symbol, the nature of interpretation, and the relationship between mantic wisdom and apocalyptic. Coverage of the second group of questions in particular is only preliminary, and awaits explication of further texts of Daniel.

#### **arrangement of material**

The surface level of the stories told is the same in essentials. A relaxed King Nebuchadnezzar is upset by a frightening dream about a great tree which shelters and sustains many. By some agency of heavenly beings the tree is destroyed but its root-stock is left in the ground. Daniel is called to interpret the dream, and to his horror he discerns that it applies to the king himself. He interprets, then begs the king to reconsider his attitudes and life-style in the light of the interpretation. Twelve months after the dream and its interpretation, Nebuchadnezzar suffers the predicted fate and endures seven units of time as an outcast from human society. Upon his acknowledgement of God's sovereignty he is reinstated, and declares throughout the empire his submission to God.

These matters are agreed upon between the versions, but there are two ways in which the arrangement of the material is different. Firstly, the material in MT vv 3-6 is not represented in G. This comprises an introduction to the person of Daniel, the beginning of an account of the

dream, and the failure of the wise men of the kingdom to interpret it. In the Septuagint version the magicians do not appear at all, and are not even mentioned at the entrance of Daniel in v 18. The aspect of the court contest is thus entirely absent.<sup>2</sup>

In MT this material serves as a link with the other court stories in Daniel. The tension builds until 'finally' (v 5, **עַד אֲדָרִין**) Daniel makes his appearance.<sup>3</sup> Immediately the reader is put in mind of the figure from ch 2 who vied at greater length with the same group of functionaries, and ultimately prevailed to become 'chief' (**רֵב**) of all of them. On his first appearance in ch 4 the link is made by introducing him in that capacity as 'chief of the magicians' (v 6, **רֵב חֲרָשֵׁיָא**). In contrast, the story of Nebuchadnezzar and the dream of the great tree stands alone in 5. This could reflect a reluctance on the part of the Septuagint to see Daniel in the same category as the mantic officials, hence a lack of interest in the court contest form. Or it could be that 5 witnesses to a stage of transmission when the stories in the Daniel cycle were still relatively independent of each other. A third option is that both possibilities obtain. The form of the story in its *Vorlage* points to an early stage in its composition history, but at the same time the treatment of that *Vorlage* shows the interests of the translator.

The second major difference is in the placing of the epistolary material. In MT the events are presented as if recounted in a letter to the subjects of Nebuchadnezzar. There are greetings and a statement of purpose at the beginning. In the final verse, the phrase 'Now I, Nebuchadnezzar...' (v 34, **כֵּעַן אֲנִי נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר**) functions as a kind of signing off. At times in between, the letter form becomes incidental to the flow of narrative and dialogue but the first person narrator serves as a reminder of its presence. There is a sense that the epistle is a deliberately crafted form. Moreover the device of the epistle provides a

---

<sup>2</sup>Note in Humphreys, 217, the difference between a court contest and a court conflict. See also Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 33. In a contest an unknown figure bests the established courtiers and is granted rank, whereas a conflict is between courtly figures as a result of which the victor is confirmed in his position.

<sup>3</sup>Torrey, 'Notes', 267, translates **עַד אֲדָרִין** as 'But at last'.

reason for the sovereign to speak autobiographically in this chapter, as opposed to the other stories about kings in the first part of Daniel. In that sense it contributes to the continuity of narrative with what precedes and what follows ch 4.

The epistolary form does not inform the narrative of the Septuagint version in the same way. The story starts straight in with 'In the eighteenth year of King Nebuchadnezzar, he said:' (Ἐτους ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου τῆς βασιλείας Ναβουχοδονοσορ εἶπεν). There is no hint of an encyclical at this stage, and it is not clear exactly who is being spoken to by the first person narrator, or for what purpose. Only in the last two verses (vv 37bf) does the suggestion of a letter come in, yet even here the situation is confused. The narrative does not take the form of a letter but tells that King Nebuchadnezzar wrote an 'encyclical' (v 37b, ἐπιστολὴν ἐγκύκλιον), then follows with a report of its contents in direct speech. V 37b is an approximation of the concluding remarks in MT v 34. However v 37c represents, somewhat more closely, the salutation in MT 3.31-33. The words ἔθνεσι, χώραις, and οἰκοῦσιν correspond to MT, with the datives reflecting the prefixed ܠ of the Aramaic. In a turn of phrase strongly reminiscent of MT 3.32, v 37c ̳ even states, 'now I will show you the works...' (νῦν ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τὰς πράξεις), yet it comes in after the summing up of v 37b. In the present form of the narrative the final verse of ̳ appears misplaced. Possibly the redactor or translator was more interested in its confessional material than its place in the story, and so placed it with v 37b as an extension of Nebuchadnezzar's confession.<sup>4</sup>

#### person of the narrator

The MT plus material of vv 3-6 and the different uses made of the epistolary form are substantial variations in the material of MT and the Septuagint. But below the surface of the stories there are other important differences. Reference has already been made to the use of the first person narrator. In MT Nebuchadnezzar reports in the first person through the device of the letter, but this is not sustained throughout

---

<sup>4</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 80, believes ̳ retains the original order. Grelot, 'La Septante', 17, turns Charles' argument on its head.

the story. At the moment that Daniel is called to interpret the king's dream (v 16), there is a shift to the third person which continues until Nebuchadnezzar emerges from his madness and his understanding returns (v 31). The final four verses are in the first person. Much ink has been spilled over the reasons for the change. Earlier commentators tended towards the view that this was merely due to carelessness on the part of the story-teller.<sup>5</sup> Others, such as Delcor, take more account of the story's plot.<sup>6</sup> He notes three main sections — the dream, its interpretation and its fulfillment — and connects the third person material with the middle section in his plot structure. A limitation of that analysis is that it does not explain why the third person narration continues to v 31 where we would have expected it to end at v 24 after the interpretation. However the value of his approach is that it treats the material in literary terms, and in that respect points towards more recent narrative critical treatments of the shift between first and third person.<sup>7</sup>

It is appropriate that Nebuchadnezzar's madness is recounted by another. Within the framework of the letter, it allows the king to acknowledge it, but spares him the telling of it.<sup>8</sup> However if that were the only reason for the shift, we would expect it to occur at v 25, 'All this came upon Nebuchadnezzar' (כלֹא מִשָּׂא עַל־נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר). But it comes earlier, at the moment that Daniel begins to respond to the king's request for an interpretation. This allows the narrator to convey the otherwise unknowable information that Daniel's 'thoughts frightened him' (v 16, רַעֲיוֹנָיו יִבְהִלֵּהוּ). At the same time it provides a change in perspective from Nebuchadnezzar to Daniel. The retelling of the dream, the interpretation, and the diplomatic problem of its application are all viewed through Daniel's eyes, although he himself is not telling the

---

<sup>5</sup>For example Charles, *Daniel*, 81, and Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 146n. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 223, an exception in his era, disagreed.

<sup>6</sup>Delcor, *Daniel*, 108

<sup>7</sup>Fewell, 97, for example.

<sup>8</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 223, recognizes this and attributes it to 'an unconscious dramatic sense'. Hartman and DiLella, 174, take up the same point.

story. An analogy may be drawn from the medium of film, in which a change in point of view can be represented by changing the camera angle.<sup>9</sup> Once Nebuchadnezzar recovers, the story is his again, the camera angle changes, and the first person is restored. Such a shift in point of view is made possible through the introduction of the third person, without destroying the effect of the wider narrative framework. Had Nebuchadnezzar spoken autobiographically of Daniel's response and interpretation, the importance of Daniel's viewpoint, as distinct from the king's, would have been diminished.<sup>10</sup>

The use of narrative person in the Septuagint is more complicated. We have seen that there are two elements of the story conveyed in the third person segment of MT: Daniel's interpretation, and the king's madness. *Ṣ* preserves the perspective of Nebuchadnezzar, the first person narrator, for both elements. The reader does not see Daniel interpreting a dream so much as the king receiving an interpretation. Editorial omniscience is permitted Nebuchadnezzar at the point where he says that Daniel ' marvelled ' (v 19, ἐθαύμασεν) and the real meaning 'dismayed' (v 19, κατέσπευθεν) him.<sup>11</sup> But there is also more description of Daniel's outward aspect, which would have struck the eye-witness narrator: 'fearful trembling seized him, and the sight of him changed, and his head shook for a moment' (v 19, φοβηθεὶς τρόμου λαβόντος αὐτὸν καὶ ἀλλοιωθείσης τῆς ὁράσεως αὐτοῦ κινήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν). The second element is the description of the king's madness. The MT narrator describes it in v 30 briefly and baldly, almost as an anticlimax. The Septuagint here also retains the first person for Nebuchadnezzar to describe his own experience (v 33a), and in more detail than the MT narrator. This may

---

<sup>9</sup>See Berlin, 44. This analogy will prove useful in our analyses of other Daniel stories also. It is not dissimilar to the concept of camera-eye technique sometimes employed by novelists. See the discussion by Stanzel, 232ff, who observes that the 'camera-eye technique does not permit a distinction between first- and third-person reference'.

<sup>10</sup>Booth, 282, describes the same phenomenon in modern fiction thus: 'If granting the hero the right to reflect his own story can insure the reader's sympathy, withholding it from him and giving it to another character can prevent too much identification...'

<sup>11</sup>Bar-Efrat, 23ff, distinguishes between overt and covert narration and editorial and neutral omniscience.



not be inappropriate to a story-teller who perceived Nebuchadnezzar's banishment to be as much a political exile as a personal illness.

The third person segment in the Septuagint occurs at vv 28-33, and coincides with the interval between Daniel's plea to Nebuchadnezzar to reform his ways in light of the dream, and the onset of the king's troubles. Thus it functions differently from the Masoretic Text segment of third person. Whether by design or by accident of textual history, it simply links two parts of the story as told by the king. It does not serve to manipulate point of view, nor does it relieve Nebuchadnezzar of having to describe his own period in exile.

The difference may partly be explained by the composite nature of the Septuagint or its *Vorlage*.<sup>12</sup> Material appears to have been used in vv 25/28-28/31 common to MT and G, with the insertion by the Septuagint of the theme of usurpation and imprisonment (vv 31f). These verses are part of the third person section in MT. If this common material has been inserted at some stage by another tradition represented in the Septuagint, the join occurs in the middle of a reported speech where Daniel is addressing King Nebuchadnezzar, just as in the MT equivalent (v 24). The G narrator continues the story in v 28 at the end of the speech and simply retains the third person of the material it is incorporating. When the Septuagint diverges again from MT the voice from heaven is being reported. The change in narrative person of the different source is not apparent until the end of that speech and the return of the narrator with the phrase 'I, Nebuchadnezzar' (v 33a, ἐγὼ Ναβουχοδονοσορ). Rather than the third person of the MT narrative being a sign of a forgetful redactor, it is more likely that the smaller piece of third person in G (vv 28-33) is the result of editorial activity.<sup>13</sup>

### the narrator in biblical literature

The matters discussed and terms used so far raise wide-ranging questions about the nature of the biblical narrator. To what extent is

---

<sup>12</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 248, calls it 'manifestly composite'.

<sup>13</sup>Note again Grelot, 'La Septante', 17, and Charles, *Daniel*, 81.

his point of view identified with God's? What is meant by omniscience when we speak of biblical narrative? Is God a character within or a narrator of the story? The questions come more sharply than usual into focus in a study of Daniel 4 because this is an extended piece of first person narrative, a rarity in biblical literature, and it contains direct speech within the first person narrative. Answers to these questions will inform our study of the text throughout this thesis, and a summary of the issues involved is in order at this point. In the process it will be possible to make some useful distinctions.

The first one is between 'story' and 'discourse'.<sup>14</sup> Story constitutes characters and events, and the world in which those characters exist and events happen. Discourse, on the other hand, is the means by which the narrator invests the story with meaning and conveys that to the reader. Discourse analysis therefore considers how a story is used by a particular narrator. In making the distinction between discourse and story we are able to distinguish between the point of view of the narrator and that of characters within the story. A particular character may reflect the narrative perspective or may be the subject of critique by the narrator. There are also characters employed simply to facilitate plot development. In the context of Daniel we will see various ways by which the narrator identifies Daniel's outlook as his own and leads the reader to do the same. In observing these things we are differentiating between story and discourse, whether or not the terminology is used.<sup>15</sup>

This raises the question of the different ways in which the narrator functions within the story. In answering it, Bar-Efrat makes a distinction between the 'covert' and 'overt' narrator.<sup>16</sup> These may be thought of as extremes at either end of a continuum rather than absolute categories. Every story contains a narrative presence of some sort,

---

<sup>14</sup>Savran, 15f

<sup>15</sup>See Powell, 23, on the importance of the story / discourse distinction when handling point of view.

<sup>16</sup>Bar-Efrat, 32. Berlin, 99, uses the less neutral term 'intrusion' to signify a more overt narrator.



however minimal, but the profile of the narrator varies. At the discourse level, the activity of the narrator is in some degree covert or overt in the measures he takes to manipulate the story and thus to influence the reader. Biblical narrators are generally more covert than overt in their activity. Little knowledge is shared with the reader that cannot be deduced from the speech and actions of the characters, or particular aspects of the setting highlighted by the narrator, or devices such as repetition or shifts in perspective. Scholars have spoken of this phenomenon in various ways. For Alter this type of narrative is intrinsic to the monotheism of the Bible.<sup>17</sup> For Bar-Efrat it means that the reader of the Bible must perceive things as we do in real life, so that a picture gradually and dynamically emerges.<sup>18</sup> In that respect biblical narrative can be said to be 'realistic'.<sup>19</sup> Bar-Efrat says the value of the covert narratorial stance is that it enables a more effective transmission of the narrator's values, although he does not attach the same theological significance to the method as Alter.<sup>20</sup> We have begun to see that the Masoretic Text narrator of Daniel is more covert than his *Ḥ* counterpart, and this results in a more multi-faceted story. This is a difference that also pertains in other stories of Daniel.

Closely connected to the distinction between the covert and overt narrator is a further distinction between 'neutral' and 'editorial' omniscience.<sup>21</sup> These too should not be thought of as absolute

---

<sup>17</sup>This quote in Alter, 155, summarizes his attitude to the storytellers of the Bible: 'Habitants of a tiny and often imperfectly monotheistic island in a vast and alluring sea of paganism, they wrote with an intent...of fulfilling or perpetuating through the act of writing a momentous revolution in consciousness.'

<sup>18</sup>Bar-Efrat, 89. Booth, 211f, calls this 'telling as showing'.

<sup>19</sup>Auerbach, 15 and 23, speaks of biblical literature as 'representation of reality', and says the Bible claims of itself that it is 'the only real world'. But Prickett, 15, cautions against making analogies with prose realism.

<sup>20</sup>Bar-Efrat, 33

<sup>21</sup>Bar-Efrat, 23.

categories.<sup>22</sup> It is in the nature of storytelling that the narrator is omniscient, but there are different ways that the omniscience is experienced by the story's readers. A more overt narrator displays his omniscience editorially from outside the story and thus enables the reader to share his omniscient perspective. The omniscience of a covert narrator is more neutral. The narrator remains largely within his story and draws the reader to his point of view by various arts, which it is part of the purpose of this thesis to explore.<sup>23</sup> In the process the alert reader gains more knowledge than any of the characters within the story. Again, generally speaking the omniscience of the MT narrator of Daniel is more neutral while that of 6 is more editorial. This point will become more obvious as our literary comparison of the Daniel stories proceeds.

Any attempt to produce a modern theory of narrative has to face the fact that some narrators are reliable and others are not, while some are more fallible than others.<sup>24</sup> There is no unanimity on the question of whether or not the biblical narrator may be relied on. A number of scholars would say that the narrator's perspective can be identified with God's. In the preliminary stages of his study, Booth asserts that the narrator of Job, and by implication the biblical narrator generally, is utterly reliable.<sup>25</sup> Savran speaks of the trustworthiness of the narrator while Sternberg emphasizes the narrator's authority.<sup>26</sup> For Alter, the narrator knows what God knows.<sup>27</sup> Gunn, however, disagrees on the grounds that the narrator neither is nor claims to be all-knowing.<sup>28</sup> No evidence emerges during the course of this study that the perspective of the narrator in Daniel is in any sense unreliable. By that, I mean that the

---

<sup>22</sup>Booth, 150, is an example of a critic of modern realistic literature who recognizes the inadequacy of the term 'omniscience' as an absolute category.

<sup>23</sup>Booth, 282, calls them 'major devices of disclosure and evaluation'.

<sup>24</sup>See for example the analysis of Booth, 158f.

<sup>25</sup>Booth, 4

<sup>26</sup>Savran, 76, and Sternberg, *Poetics*, 77 and 98.

<sup>27</sup>Alter, 157

<sup>28</sup>Gunn, 60f

attitude which the narrator induces in the reader towards events and characters in the stories is that of the implied author.<sup>29</sup>

The implied author is a construct in the reader's mind and as such plays a part within the narrative.<sup>30</sup> The attitudes and perspectives so displayed by him need not coincide with those of the actual author. However, since we cannot be certain of the actual authors of the ancient texts of Daniel, no distinction can be made between them. Because the narrator is reliable, he is also virtually identical to the implied author. The fact that Nebuchadnezzar tells the story of his own dream and its subsequent interpretation places a strain on that coincidence, and for the only time in the stories of Daniel, a gap appears between narrator and implied author. The problem for the implied author in Daniel 4 is how to ensure that his own point of view rather than Nebuchadnezzar's prevails. That end is achieved in the Masoretic Text through the inclusion of a third person section and the device of the epistle, aspects that are discussed above. In addition, the appearance and speech of the angel (v 14) shifts responsibility for the story away from Nebuchadnezzar and onto the implied author. By way of contrast, Nebuchadnezzar does seem to be given considerable responsibility for his own story in 5 and the smaller amount of third person material is not sufficient to disturb that.

None of this articulates the relationship between God and the implied author or his reliable narrator, a problem peculiar to biblical literature. The working proposition generally adopted is that the narrator's perspective can be identified with that of God, and therefore God is understood to be the implied author. However, there is a tendency for critics to find solace in theological assertions when addressing this question.<sup>31</sup> The tension is inherent in the fact that God not only functions effectively as the narrator but he also sometimes enters the story as one of the characters to be encountered by the reader as other

---

<sup>29</sup>See Bar-Efrat, 14, on the distinction between narrator and implied author.

<sup>30</sup>Powell, 19ff

<sup>31</sup>Savran, 88, for example.

characters are encountered.<sup>32</sup> Whether or not the literary phenomenon of God's presence within and outside biblical narrative will ever be able to be reduced to a proposition, it is a paradox evident in Daniel 4, as becomes clear when the use of dialogue in each version is considered.

### the nature of the king's exile

Aside from literary considerations, the differing use of the third person narrator may partly be explained as a consequence of the different views of the versions on what happened in the seven 'times' (עֲדָנִין in MT, καιροὶ in θ) or 'years' (ἔτη in Ϛ). MT sees this as a period of some sort of mental derangement on the part of the king. His heart was 'altered from that of men' (v 13, מִן-אִנְשָׁא יִשְׁנֶן), and at the end of the time Nebuchadnezzar's 'understanding returned' (v 31, מִנְדַּעִי...יָחֹב). Consequent on that was his confirmation in the kingdom (v 33). This bears some likeness to the 'Prayer of Nabonidus', which tells of the king's exile in Teiman, although there it is a result of some sort of physical rather than mental suffering (שְׁדִנָּא).<sup>33</sup> In the Ϛ view there is also an element of mental illness or distress as vividly described in the phrase 'My flesh was changed, as well as my heart' (v 33b, ἡλλοιώθη ἡ σὰρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδιά μου). It is impossible to say whether mental suffering followed on physical banishment or brought it about, but both aspects are present. There is a strong suggestion as well that Nebuchadnezzar was usurped and imprisoned. This is expressed most clearly in v 25. In the allegory of the great tree the felling represents a banishment, and eating 'the grass of the earth with the beasts of the earth' (v 17a, τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς) represents the time in the wilderness.

These events suggested by the Septuagint account recall the

---

<sup>32</sup>See for example Bar-Efrat, 19. Gunn, 60f, also notes that at such moments God can seem neither omnipotent nor omniscient. But that particular quandary is not encountered in Daniel.

<sup>33</sup>Milik, 'Prière de Nabonide', 408. Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 63, suggests that 4QPrNab points to a 'remote common source'. But note the doubts expressed by García Martínez, 129ff, about the dependence of Daniel on the Prayer of Nabonidus. See also Wiseman, *Nebuchadnezzar*, 104.

'Nabonidus Chronicle' and 'The Verse Account of Nabonidus', in which sources the king is absent for long periods of time in the city of Teiman.<sup>34</sup> His exile was to some extent self-imposed, but there also appears to have been conflict between the king and the Babylonian establishment. This possibly related to Nabonidus' espousal of the cult of Sin, the moon god, which resulted in opposition to the king from the priests and helps explain their reference to his madness.<sup>35</sup> Leaving aside for the moment the question of whether or not Nabonidus is to be found in the Daniel tales, these Ancient Near Eastern sources suggest a common tradition of some sort of royal exile, which has received divergent interpretations by the two versions of Daniel 4. The Septuagint seems to take us a little closer to the political events behind the fulfillment of Nebuchadnezzar's dream.

From a literary perspective, the emphasis of the ̣ account on exile, rather than madness, makes it more appropriate for Nebuchadnezzar to retain the narrative point of view in the way that he does. His words thus become a kind of apologia and it is not so necessary as in MT to spare him the recounting of his madness. This also has a bearing on the characterization of Daniel in the two stories. In effect he has little more personality in ̣ than the mysterious Jew in the 'Prayer of Nabonidus'. In both versions he is portrayed as having a collegial rather than adversarial relationship with the king, but he plays a more prominent role in MT because God's judgement is conveyed to Nebuchadnezzar from Daniel's point of view. In ̣ he is a functionary in the king's personal account of what happened to him.

### **wisdom in Daniel**

This raises a point that is central to the characterization of Daniel in the stories of his interactions with different kings. What is the nature of wisdom evident in Daniel and his relationship with the Babylonian officials? Lacocque distinguishes between mantic and aphoristic wisdom. He does not define mantic wisdom but seems to

---

<sup>34</sup>Pritchard, *Texts*, 305f and 312ff

<sup>35</sup>Lewy, 437

associate it with the ecstatic experiences of the visionary. Ezekiel is cited as an example of such wisdom and the experience of Daniel in 7.28 and 8.27 is thought of in the same terms.<sup>36</sup> Müller and Vanderkam go farther and link mantic wisdom to divination, the seer's claim to special enlightenment, and the encoding of reality in symbols.<sup>37</sup>

Lacocque thinks of the distinction in chronological terms.<sup>38</sup> As prophecy shifted from shamanic or mystical to 'logoic', so wisdom shifted from mantic or 'primitive' to aphoristic. He sees the precursor of Daniel in the mystical experiences of Ezekiel.<sup>39</sup> For him the visions show Daniel as both mantic sage and prophet whereas in the stories he is more an aphoristic originator of wisdom. The problem with this point of view is that even in the oldest stories about him Daniel is portrayed as a mantic sage.<sup>40</sup> Whether or not the identification of different types of wisdom can answer historical questions is raised in more detail in the concluding chapter of the thesis. In the meantime it is perhaps more helpful to think in terms of 'trajectories' of wisdom without requiring each to be mutually exclusive of the other. This is the approach of Hayman, who identifies three trajectories in evidence about the time that the versions of Daniel would have been finding their final form.<sup>41</sup> After Qohelet, wisdom either became identified with the Torah on a cosmic scale, or became involved in reshaping the ancient myth of secret heavenly wisdom, or married the speculative and the philosophical with Jewish wisdom. These three developments may well have rubbed up against each other if not been positively hostile to one another. Certainly a conflict between torah wisdom and the apocalyptic wisdom of heavenly secrets was later reflected in a tension between developing orthodoxy and

---

<sup>36</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 185ff

<sup>37</sup>Vanderkam, 6f, and Müller, 'Mantische Weisheit', 285f.

<sup>38</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 189

<sup>39</sup>See also Delcor, *Daniel*, 167, on the link with Ezekiel 17.

<sup>40</sup>Vanderkam, 6

<sup>41</sup>Hayman, 106ff

popular religion.<sup>42</sup>

One of the concerns of this thesis will be to see whether the differences in characterization of the sage between MT and ̔ in the stories reflects a consistently different type of wisdom in the terms outlined above. It is too early to draw conclusions but it is noteworthy that the Masoretic Text of Daniel 4, by including the court contest aspect and Daniel's position as chief of the mantic officials, places him in the same category as those officials. In the Septuagint his wisdom lies simply in the interpretation of the dreams (v 18). However, the evidence is contradictory as ̔ v 19 speaks of the 'true meaning' (ὁπρόνοια) being revealed to Daniel, which has mantic connotations more appropriate to the visions. Incidentally, as we will see in the discussion below on the dream's interpretation, this is not the only place where the vocabulary of ̔ seems to have links with the later chapters of Daniel. At this stage it must suffice to say that a distinction that will recur has been made between different types of wisdom.

#### use of dialogue

The changes in narrative person in each version are part of the wider question of the presence of the narrator and the use of dialogue in the two versions. A characteristic of Old Testament narrative is the primacy of dialogue.<sup>43</sup> Visual details tend to be sparsely reported, and the essence of the story and its characters revealed through dialogue.<sup>44</sup> Repetition of material in both narrative and dialogue, or by different speakers, is manipulated for various effects.<sup>45</sup> In the telling of the stories, the narrative skill is in being able to keep the persona of the

---

<sup>42</sup>Hayman, 108

<sup>43</sup>Moberly, *Genesis*, 40, writes that the 'points at which the story teller usually places what he considers most important are usually the speeches made by the main characters at the dramatically crucial moments'.

<sup>44</sup>Alter, 65 and 70

<sup>45</sup>Alter, 70ff



narrator distinct from the speaker of dialogue.<sup>46</sup> Failure to do so means that the impact of the use of reported speech is diluted. This characteristic use of dialogue can be seen in the MT version of Daniel 4.

Excluding the first person sections, just under 60% of the material is direct speech, the two most important blocks being the king's long speech to Daniel (vv 6-15) and the latter's reply (vv 17-24). In addition there is a brief interchange between the two (v 16), Nebuchadnezzar's boastful soliloquy (v 27), and the voice from heaven (vv 28f). Within the chapter there are three accounts of the dream, its interpretation, and its purpose to demonstrate that God rules (vv 7-14, 17-22, and 29). Each time, the material is conveyed by dialogue, an indicator of its importance as a narrative tool.

The potential for confusion when dialogue is reported by a first person narrator is considerable. The complexity increases with the reported speech of the watcher (vv 10f) within the king's account of the dream to Daniel.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the recipient of the watcher's command (v 11) is an unseen presence. Indeed by v 14 of the Masoretic Text the reader wonders who is telling the story, the watcher or Nebuchadnezzar. For a brief moment it does not seem to matter because the dream and its reason ('so that the living might know...', v 14) has taken over the form of the narrative. The effect is heightened by the cryptic message at the start of that verse (v 14), roughly translated 'By a decree of the watchers is the message, and a word of the holy ones is the question'. This consists of two nominal clauses containing four words, each with a wide range of meaning (שאלה, פתגם, נאמר, and גזרה), with the first word prefixed by the multi-purpose ב. The Greek of Theodotion is similarly ambiguous. These words are spoken neither by the watcher, nor by the watcher's agent, nor by Nebuchadnezzar. A new level of authority and

---

<sup>46</sup>Sternberg, *Poetics*, 73. On this point the view of Savran, 37, that 'quoted direct speech involves a temporary transfer of the role of narrator to the quoting character' is contradictory.

<sup>47</sup>Murray, 304, considers the 'watcher' (עיר) to be an angelic being, and the term is in apposition to 'holy one' (קדוש) in 4.10. I accept that view for the present context, but the question must be addressed further in relation to the 'holy ones' of ch 7. See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 43 and 72, for a similar parallelism in 1QGenAp.

mystery is thereby introduced into the narrative, necessary to the statement of purpose that follows.<sup>48</sup> At that point the implied author of the story has taken over from the narrator. If Nebuchadnezzar himself were reporting it with any degree of understanding, Daniel's interpretation would be quite unnecessary. Yet for a brief moment a protagonist is doubling as commentator.<sup>49</sup>

The different levels of narration can be thought of as operating parenthetically. A bracket opens with the watcher's speech (v 11), and another is opened by the mysterious statement of v 14a. Within these brackets the story is permitted a limited life of its own, distinct from the wider narrative form. Just when the story-teller threatens to lose control of his form altogether, the brackets close and he re-asserts himself with 'I, King Nebuchadnezzar saw ...And you, Belteshazzar, tell...' (v 15, **וְהָיָה אֵלֶּיךָ מֶלֶךְ נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר וְאַתָּה בִּלְטֶשְׁצַר אַמֵּר**). The reader is jolted back into the first person narrative, into the dialogue between Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, and into the setting of the court contest. The emphatics 'I' and 'you' serve as important markers in this process. Through the rest of the Masoretic Text of ch 4, the distinction between speaker and narrator is preserved.

The story-teller of the Septuagint version manipulates his dialogue in quite a different way. The narrative, which is about one-fifth longer than in MT, is almost entirely reported speech. In fact the only narrator presence is in the six word introduction of v 4, the description of the interlude between vision and fulfillment (vv 28-31), and 'King Nebuchadnezzar wrote an encyclical...' (v 37b). Effectively, Nebuchadnezzar is the narrator and it is his perspective that prevails throughout. Within that broad framework there are different layers of reported speech. By v 15 there are no less than four layers alive in the narrative. The narrator reports the speech of King Nebuchadnezzar, who reports his dream and within it the words of the angel, who orders

---

<sup>48</sup>Bevan, 91, suggests the cryptic nature of the verse reflects an inscrutable judgement. According to Auerbach, 11, an important characteristic of biblical narrative is that it is 'fraught with background'. The present instance typifies that.

<sup>49</sup>Sternberg, *Poetics*, 112

another being to 'Hew it down..' (v 14, ἐκκόψατε αὐτὸ) and records the words that that being is commanded to say. In addition there is a recipient of the commands of vv 15f, who does not speak. By now, several speakers are sharing the stage and point of view has become unclear. V 17a, and more particularly v 18, point the reader back to Nebuchadnezzar and re-establish the setting of the king recounting a dream.

The style is reminiscent of some talmudic literature where the distinctions between different speakers, and between speakers and the compilers, are maintained in the mind of the reader only with difficulty. The concern is not with narrative flow, but with an accurate reporting of the views of different speakers.<sup>50</sup> A similar effect may be seen in vv 13-15 of the Septuagint, where the report of speech becomes more important than the quality of narrative. The writer or editor has been more concerned with presenting the dream and its meaning than with a carefully crafted dialogue, or subtlety in characterization. Consequently there is a sense of unfinished business about this section. The lack of multiple points of view, here and elsewhere in the Θ version, results in a more monochrome narrative. The depth and ambiguity that more than one point of view permits is not present to the same extent.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> An example from B.Talmud, Megillah 3a: R. Jeremiah—or some say R. Hiyya b. Abba—also said: The *Targum* of the Pentateuch was composed by Onkelos the proselyte under the guidance of R. Eleazer and R. Joshua. The *Targum* of the prophets was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and the land of Israel [thereupon] quaked over an area of four hundred *parasangs* by four hundred *parasangs* and a *Bath Kol* came forth and exclaimed, Who is this that has revealed My secrets to mankind? Jonathan b. Uzziel thereupon arose and said, it is I who have revealed Thy secrets to mankind. It is fully known to Thee that I have not done this for my own honour or for the honour of my father's house, but for Thy honour I have done it, that dissension may not increase in Israel. He further sought to reveal [by] a *targum* [the inner meaning] of the Hagiographa, but a *Bath Kol* went forth and said, Enough! What was the reason?—Because the date of the Messiah is foretold in it.

This passage, incidentally, is used when discussing the authorship of Θ. See Grelot, 'Les Versions Grecques', 395.

<sup>51</sup> Berlin, 51

## symbol or allegory?

So far our focus has been on narrative person and the use of dialogue, and their effect on point of view in the MT and Septuagint versions. But there are also differences in content, and in treatment of that content. The central symbol of the great tree is an important case in point. At one level it functions in the same way in both stories. It is a myth of cosmic security, drawing on a number of biblical uses of tree imagery and mythology.<sup>52</sup> At another level the symbol is interpreted in different ways.

In vv 8 and 17 the Masoretic Text describes the greatness of the tree in terms of its beauty, its cosmic proportions, and its provision of food and shelter for the world. It then focuses on one basic point of similarity between the tree and the king, and the greatness of each. This is explicit in the parallels between vv 17 and 19. The tree's height 'reached to heaven' (v 17, **יָמַשׁ לַשָּׁמַיִם**), and the king's greatness 'reaches to heaven' (v 19, **מָשַׁח לַשָּׁמַיִם**). The tree's appearance is 'to all the earth' (v 17, **לְכָל-אֲרֶעָא**), while the king's rule is 'to the end of the earth' (v 19, **לְסוֹף אֲרֶעָא**). That one point is expanded on as the king's greatness suffers the same fate as the tree's greatness. Both are cut down, both share a life with the beasts, and the sentence of both is for a limited period until the stump sends forth new shoots and the king is restored. The dream and its interpretation, the tree and the king, are in close correspondence but they are also distinct.<sup>53</sup> In one sense the dream of the tree transcends its immediate historical context and becomes a symbol of the sovereignty of God over kings. This transcending effect is achieved by bracketing the story of Nebuchadnezzar with confessions of the greatness of God over human kings (vv 3.33 and 4.34). The concept recurs as a *Leitmotif* in the body of the chapter at vv 14, 22, 29 and 32.

In the hands of ⑤ a series of one-to-one correspondences between the dream and the life of the king results in an allegory on the life of

---

<sup>52</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 92, and Coxon, 'The Great Tree', 94ff.

<sup>53</sup>Coxon, 'The Great Tree', 99, uses the word parable, but considers that elements of animal fable are introduced, and the king is first symbolized by the tree then by the animals sheltering under it.

Nebuchadnezzar, rather than a transcendent statement on the sovereignty of kings.<sup>54</sup> The birds of heaven represent 'the might of the earth...' (v 21, ἡ ἰσχὺς τῆς γῆς), namely the various political entities within the empire. The growth of the tree is like the king's heart growing 'in arrogance and might towards the Holy One and his angels' (v 22, ὑπερηφανία καὶ ἰσχύι τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ). This arrogance is given a specific instance in how the king 'desolated the house of the living God' (v 22, ἐξερήμωσας τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος). Although the band of iron and bronze around the stump of the tree in MT does not appear in the Septuagint version, it is known to the compiler and is hinted at in the reference to his being 'in bronze fetters and handcuffs' (v 17a, ἐν πέδαις καὶ ἐν χειροπέδαις χαλκαῖς) and 'bound' (v 32, δῆσουσί σε). This picture is graphically expanded in the interpretation to include the idea of imprisonment and exile as events in the life of the king. In these ways a symbol of the humiliation of greatness has become something different.

An example of the allegorizing tendencies of the Septuagint version may be seen by comparing the versions at the point in the account of the dream where the 'it' of the tree becomes the 'him' of the person of the king. The dream is told twice in MT, excluding its implementation in vv 28ff. Vv 12f and v 20 are almost identical in their use of the masculine pronomial suffix, -וֹ- or -וֹ-. The fact that 'tree' (אֵילָנָא) is masculine in Aramaic means the reference of the pronouns is ambiguous. This allows a subtle movement from dream to interpretation, with maximum effect and a minimum of artifice and intrusion on the part of the narrator. The central moment in the process is the phrase 'with the beasts (of the field) will be his lot' (v 12, עִם-חַיִּוֹתָא חִלְקָהּ and v 20, עִם-חַיִּוֹת בְּרָא חִלְקָהּ). Until then the referent is the tree. The only other occurrence of חִלְקָהּ in Biblical Aramaic is in Ezra 4.16, where it has a clear application to human affairs. In Biblical Hebrew there are numerous witnesses to the word, and almost all speak of some sort of allotment or destiny for human beings. It is likely then that the first readers of this account would

---

<sup>54</sup>Goldingay, 'The Stories in Daniel', 105. See also Towner, *Daniel*, 66. For a further example of such one-to-one correspondence in the Septuagint, see the interpretation of Mordecai's dream in the additional Septuagint material at the end of Esther (© Esth 10.3c-3f).

have sensed that 'his lot' (חלקה) could not refer to the tree.

This dawning awareness is confirmed differently in each of the two MT accounts, and between them a progression in understanding may be observed, as the first is less specific than the second. In v 13 the humanity of the one whose lot is with the beasts is emphasized by the use of 'heart' (לבב). In v 21 the same effect is achieved with the statement, 'it is a decree...which has come upon my lord, the king' (גזרת...די משה על-מרא מלכא). By implication, what came before ועם-דמות ברא חלקה can be read back as applicable to the king. The Greek of Theodotion is able to exploit the same ambiguity of personal pronoun as the Aramaic. The result is an identification of the tree and its fate with the king and his fate without any explanation necessary. Remembering that the account is autobiographical at the first telling, this technique enables Nebuchadnezzar to tell the dream and hint at its solution, while remaining distinct from the implied author.

The Septuagint goes about its task in quite a different way. There is not the same sense of metamorphosis as the tree gradually becomes the king in the mind of the reader.<sup>55</sup> Here the narrator takes no chances that the reader may miss the point. The change from tree to king takes place between vv 15 and 16. In v 14 the neuter accusative 'it' (αὐτό) can only apply to 'tree' (δένδρον). In v 16 'his body' (το σῶμα αὐτοῦ) can only apply to a person.<sup>56</sup> There is no point at which the reader is left to draw his own conclusions. This adds to the impression explored above of a more allegorical interpretation. It also relates to earlier comments about the person of the narrator. Here Nebuchadnezzar not only tells the dream but almost takes responsibility for its interpretation. It is not unprecedented for a narrator to reveal more than he can know about himself, nor for him to double as commentator. There is always a risk in doing so that dramatic tension will be lost, and such a loss is sustained at this point by the Septuagint account.

---

<sup>55</sup> Anderson, 43, also uses 'metamorphosis' to describe the process.

<sup>56</sup> Coxon, 'Nebuchadnezzar's Madness', 5, suggests τὸ κύτος (vv 11 and 20) can mean a human torso. If he is correct the word has a double referent. Coxon's suggestion receives some support from Liddell and Scott.



## symbol and allegory: a distinction

In the above section I have used several terms and implied distinctions that need to be clarified at this point. In particular I used the terms 'symbol' and 'allegory' and also suggested that one account is more 'transcendent' than the other. This distinction can be explicated by looking at a debate that occurred some years ago between Perrin and Collins. Perrin suggested that symbols may be understood either as 'steno-symbols' or 'tensive' symbols.<sup>57</sup> The former are not transcendent and may be reduced to the one-to-one correspondence of allegory. He argued that such symbols are the type used in apocalyptic literature. Collins, and later Lacocque, took issue with Perrin to say that apocalyptic symbolism is not merely allegory.<sup>58</sup> Such symbols may indeed refer to historical events but they function in such a way as to transcend those events. They are not tied to a single one-to-one formulation.<sup>59</sup> Another way of expressing this is to say that allegory moves from the mysterious to the revealed while symbol is rooted in everyday realities yet takes on a wider significance.<sup>60</sup> In subsequent work Collins explores the subtleties of the difference between allegory and symbol. Allegory is not always necessarily naive, he says, and can be thought of as one kind of symbolic language.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless symbolism does tend to move in a different direction from allegory.

Lacocque discusses this point in terms of the interpretation of

---

<sup>57</sup>Perrin, 553

<sup>58</sup>Collins, 'Symbolism of Transcendence', 15, and Lacocque, 'Apocalyptic Symbolism', 7.

<sup>59</sup>Collins, 'Symbolism of Transcendence', 17. See also Croatto, 78, who says that symbols are 'natural things transparently referring to a second meaning which somehow transcends phenomenal experience'.

<sup>60</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 127. Note Lacocque, 'Apocalyptic Symbolism', on the influence of Ricoeur in this debate. Ricoeur, 55f, says that a symbol is transcendent in that it gives access to a 'surplus of meaning' which takes the reader beyond the language in which the symbolism is couched. See also McGaughey, 431f, for a discussion of Ricoeur's theory of symbol.

<sup>61</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 111. Note also the comments of Caird, 163, on parable and allegory.



dreams.<sup>62</sup> He suggests that dreams were normally interpreted analogically in ancient thought but the Israelite approach broke new ground in that the significance of the dream transcended the signifier. Others approach the topic through an exploration of Daniel as either *peshar* or *midrash*. However they couch their discussion, such critics also accept that the symbols of apocalyptic transcend their temporal context.<sup>63</sup> What we see in this comparison of two versions of Daniel 4 is that the Septuagint perhaps reflects a more analogical, or allegorical, approach while MT seeks to bring a transcendent significance to the dream and events arising from it. Another aspect of the same phenomenon arises particularly acutely in grappling with the link between Daniel's vision and its interpretation in ch 7. There the Septuagint keeps the earthly and heavenly realms more distinct from one another than does MT. There too we will have cause to discuss in more detail the nature of symbols as they function in the book of Daniel. Like the consideration of different types of wisdom, discussion of the use made of symbols will continue to be a feature of the comparison in subsequent chapters.

#### differences in interpretation

In contrast to the economy with which MT recounts the dream and interprets it, the Old Greek version contains elements not present in MT. At one level these variations reflect a different type of symbolism and approach to the interpretation of dreams. At another level, however, they have less to do with the story at hand than with the polemical requirements of the 5 narrator. The hint of a usurper is a case in point.<sup>64</sup> The king's vision does not demand any explanation of events during the 'seven times' or 'years' (MT vv 13, 20, 22 and 29, שבעה עדנים,

---

<sup>62</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 130

<sup>63</sup>See for example the debate between Silberman, 329ff, and Seeligmann, 83. The latter places Daniel in a contemporizing midrashic tradition whereas Silberman says that it is *peshar* rather than *midrash* which does the contemporizing. This is part of a wider debate on the applicability of the category 'midrash' to Daniel. Horgan, 252, on the evidence from Qumran, says *peshar* is pre-70 and *midrash* is post-70. See also the cautionary comments of Koch, 'Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?', 125f.

<sup>64</sup>Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 31

and Ἔ vv 16, 32 and 34, ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη) and none is offered by MT, besides the hint that the king was 'confirmed in (his) kingdom' (v 33, על-מלכותי ההקנה), and the suggestion by the voice from heaven that God gives kingdoms 'to whomever he pleases' (v 29, לְמִן־דִּי יַצְבֵּא).<sup>65</sup> The Septuagint, however, speaks of the kingdom 'given to another, a man of no account in your house' (v 31, ἐτέρῳ δίδοται ἐξουθενημένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου) and expands on what exactly that would entail.

Clearly the narrator of Ἔ has something in mind also when he specifies the evidence of King Nebuchadnezzar's arrogance, that he 'desolated the house of the living God because of the sins of the consecrated people' (v 22, ἐξερήμωσας τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἡγιασμένου).<sup>66</sup> The reference to the desolation and to the consecrated people has echoes of the Maccabean period, and particularly the struggle with Antiochus IV, but neither aspect is witnessed to anywhere in the first 6 chapters of Daniel MT.<sup>67</sup> A possible exception is the condemnation of Belshazzar in 5.23, as the Ἔ translation of that verse uses the word ὑψώθης, the same word used by the Septuagint in 4.22 of Nebuchadnezzar. The manifestation of Belshazzar's arrogance was his misuse of the temple vessels, but even then there is no reference to the sort of events envisaged in Ἔ 4.22. Similarly the word ἐξερήμωσας has no presence in MT Daniel 1-6, but is a familiar theme in the second half of the book. In 8.13, 9.27 and 11.31 ἐρημώσεως, or some other form of the same root, occurs in the context of violence against the temple or the system of sacrifices or the covenant. 'The consecrated people' (τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἡγιασμένου) likewise suggests the latter chapters of Daniel where the expression 'the holy ones' (οἱ ἅγιοι) features often.

Still in Ἔ 4.22, the phrase ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις is a puzzle. The ἐπὶ could carry a causal sense so the desolation has come about because of

---

<sup>65</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities* X.217, goes further than MT to note 'none venturing to seize the government during these seven years'. This represents a different tradition again from that in Ἔ.

<sup>66</sup>Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 206, considers that Nebuchadnezzar's faults in Ἔ are more like those of Antiochus IV.

<sup>67</sup>Grelot, 'La Septante', 15

the sins of the people, who need refining and punishing. That appears to be the understanding in 3.37 where Azariah laments the troubles of Israel brought about 'because of our sins' (3.37, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν). On the other hand ἐπὶ could be a preposition of agency in that the sinful ones themselves played a part in bringing about the desolation. Both senses may be found supported in 11.30ff, where there is talk of those who violated the covenant. It is this that perhaps lies behind the oblique reference to 'the sins of the consecrated people' and introduces a theme from a later period into the much earlier provenance of Nebuchadnezzar and his relations with exilic Jews.

There is only one exceptional reference to sacrifices and burnt offerings (2.46) in the Persian or Babylonian setting of MT chs 2-6. Yet the Septuagint version of ch 4 introduces the concept with 'I will bring sacrifices for the sake of my soul to the Most High...' (v 37a, περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τῷ ὑψίστῳ θυσίας προσοίσω). Again this suggests the setting of chs 7-12 where the Masoretic Text is interested in matters relating to the Temple cult. Apart from the incidental allusion to the time of the 'evening sacrifice' (9.21, **נֶחֱמֶה-עֶרֶב**), there are two other important readings in 9.27 and 11.31, which speak of the end of the sacrifices. In both, the context is the destruction of the sanctuary, another theme from the visions that 3 ch 4 shows to be a concern of the earlier chapters of the Septuagint.

#### differences in the account of the dream

Dreams in the Old Testament are often clear in their meaning and non-specific in details. A dream-like sense of clarity with generality is preserved by the MT narrative. Phrases such as 'seven seasons' (vv 13, 20, and 29, **שִׁבְעָה עֲדָנִין**) add to the effect. This tone is not present in the 3 narrative. On two occasions it includes details that reflect its more allegorical approach and seem inappropriate to the dream setting as evoked by MT. The first is the description of the tree as 'thirty stadia in length' (v 12, μήκει ὡς σταδίων τριάκοντα). The second is the use of the more specific ἔτη (vv 33a and 34, 'year') instead of the undefined καιροὶ (θ) or **עֲדָנִין** (MT), which are best translated as 'times' or 'seasons'. Both of these examples are almost banal in the context of the dream of the great tree, and do not bring the same transcendent

quality to the vision as MT. The 'thirty stadia' detracts from the sense of greatness that it is attempting to explicate. The 'years' attempts to define a period of time that is deliberately left ambiguous in MT. The lack of definition as an expression of the sovereignty of God over kings is an effect not present in the Septuagint.

A similar example is found in 5 v 11 where the the cosmic tree acquires the quality of light-giver: 'The sun and moon dwelt in it, and it lit all the earth'. This element of the description is not inappropriate in the way I have suggested for the other extra details above, but it is an element that plays no further part in ch 4 and contributes nothing to the subsequent allegorical interpretation of the dream. The fruitfulness, the height and bulk, the provision of shelter, and the greatness of the tree are all included in the interpretation, but there is no application to the king of its light-giving qualities.

#### **literary merit in the Septuagint**

If I have conveyed some dissatisfaction with the literary qualities of the Septuagint version, that is not to say it is without any merit. The section just referred to succeeds in applying the imagery of light and shade in contrasting ways to the tree. On the one hand it 'cast a shadow' (v 12, ἐσκιάζον) over all those under it. On the other it becomes the source of light to all those living in its shadow (v 11). It sustains by lighting and by protecting from light.

The style of the Old Greek is fulsome rather than economical but there are times when a neat turn of phrase arrests the reader. An example is the last part of v 27: 'Accept these words for my word is accurate, and your time is fulfilled' (τούτους τοὺς λόγους ἀγάπησον ἀκριβὴς γάρ μου ὁ λόγος καὶ πλήρης ὁ χρόνος σου). The balance of the sentence encapsulates the contrast between God and King Nebuchadnezzar essential to the story. As God addresses the king his μου confronts Nebuchadnezzar's σου, his λόγος controls the king's χρόνος, and the certainty (ἀκριβὴς) of that word ensures its fulfillment (πλήρης). Similarly the humiliation of being usurped and the gall of the usurper are captured in the phrase, 'Until sunrise another king will make merry in your house...' (v 31, ἕως δὲ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς βασιλεὺς ἕτερος

εὐφρανθήσεται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου).<sup>68</sup>

### conclusion

The Masoretic Text tells about a king's dream of a great tree and applies it to the issue of human rulers under the control of divine sovereignty. This issue is explored in the form of a letter from Nebuchadnezzar to his subjects, with allowance made for the divine viewpoint as well as the perspective that Daniel brings to the story. The dream is interpreted and applied as a symbol of the subjection of human greatness, with little reference to events in the king's life beyond the episode of madness or exile. In that respect the story-teller does not appear to have an axe to grind against Nebuchadnezzar personally. As a participant in the court contest, Daniel's point of view is also present in the story and he is the vehicle through whom the judgement of God is conveyed to Nebuchadnezzar. As a literary composition MT is largely consistent in its use of the epistolary form and its manipulation of narrative person, dialogue, and point of view within that form.<sup>69</sup> The result is a well-told story that fits the context given it by the Masoretic Text in a series of accounts of Jews in the court at Babylon.

The Septuagint is not so concerned with narrative consistency or with setting the story in the context of other court stories. Consequently the placing of the epistolary material and the role of Nebuchadnezzar as narrator are problematic. Daniel exists only incidentally in the telling. The version's attitude towards the king is more adversarial, perhaps reflecting the setting behind chs 7-12. In addition, the description of the tree is more detailed and its interpretation is more allegorical than symbolic. The  $\Theta$  version, for all its similarity, is markedly different in both form and content from the story told in MT ch 4.

---

<sup>68</sup>Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 30, translates the phrase somewhat differently but with similar results: 'By sunrise another king will make merry in your house...'

<sup>69</sup>There are some bumps, such as in MT v 6 where  $\text{וַיִּזְכֹּר}$  seems out of place, and is a disputed reading.

As a by-product of this comparison of the MT and G versions of Daniel 4 we have also summarized several issues which serve as a background to the wider study. In noting that the narrator of MT is more covert and that of G more overt, we delineated several terms that will be used in future discussion of the role of the narrator. In connection with the presentation of the person of Daniel, distinctions between different types of wisdom were made although no conclusions were drawn in the application of them. The function of symbols was also touched on. As well as the literary points made, this chapter hinted at a historical puzzle posed by the comparison. The Septuagint seems to be later than MT in that it tells the story in a way that looks forward to the visions. At the same time, the less crafted form of the story in G suggests that it could be an earlier version than the Masoretic Text. All of these issues await further illustration and clarification in other stories of Daniel and his friends in the court of the Babylonian king.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### DANIEL 5

In Daniel 5 the story of Belshazzar and the handwriting on the wall is told. The effects of the variations between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint stories are similar to those in Daniel 4, but their nature is somewhat different. While the contrasting motives of the narrators of ch 4 are shown up in a lengthy  $\text{\textcircled{G}}$  plus, those differences appear in a significant MT plus in the story to which we now turn our attention. As it is a different type of story from the dream of the great tree, and as there are not the same issues as were raised by the epistolary form in the previous chapter, the approach to a literary comparison will vary a little.

The plot structure is almost identical in both versions of ch 5 and I refer to this aspect only incidentally. There are other similarities which I do touch on, particularly in the setting of the story and the sin for which Belshazzar is being condemned. There are also important differences in the setting which bear on other aspects of the story. I detail these, and then explore other variations between the MT and  $\text{\textcircled{G}}$  accounts. In particular I consider the king's motivation, portrayal of characters, operation of perspective and the relationship of narrator to reader. I then consider what effect these differences in the way the story is told have on the part played by the writing on the wall. This allows us to detect a differing purpose and theological viewpoint between the two versions. As part of that exploration other noteworthy literary devices are considered, and there is a brief excursus on the theme of words and vision.





The final section constitutes a look at the links between this story and ch 4. It will be seen that the two chapters are almost inseparable in the Masoretic Text and almost independent of each other in the Septuagint, a phenomenon that has much to do with the differing narrative purposes of each.

But before turning to the main text, the presence of a prologue to the Septuagint account, in the form of a brief abstract of the story, should be noted. This contains the information unattested elsewhere that the feast took place at 'the dedication of his kingdoms' (ἐγκαινισμοῦ τῶν βασιλείων) and that the number of guests was two thousand. The words of the writing on the wall are transcribed as they appear in Daniel's interpretation (vv 26 ff), just as they are in θ v 25. The explanation for these variations is an unfinished debate between those who see a late attempt to clarify an incomplete 𐤂 text and those who see an early form of the tradition underlying ch 5.<sup>1</sup>

### setting

In both versions the setting is a feast put on by King Belshazzar for members of his court. The occasion for the feast is not made explicit in either version. In both accounts wine is drunk and the sacred vessels deported from Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar are desecrated. This action evokes an immediate divine response, the writing on the wall. The immediacy expressed by שעה (v 5, 'moment') is watered down a little by the Septuagint use of ὥρα, a reading also adopted by Theodotion.<sup>2</sup> After the appearance of the hand, the rest of the chapter is spent in explicating the significance of that hand and the events that gave rise to it.

Wine and the banquet setting play a significant part in both accounts. Although neither version condemns the excessive behaviour of

---

<sup>1</sup>For example compare Montgomery, *Daniel*, 267, with Wills, 122.

<sup>2</sup>Daniel 3.6 supports the view that שעה in earlier Aramaic has the sense of immediacy and consequence.

the participants *per se*, both link it with the sin of Belshazzar and his guests. The presence of the king's companions is mentioned again in v 23, where Daniel outlines the king's failings. It seems important to both narrators to repeat the guest list. This has the effect of evoking the banquet milieu at the same time that the king's sins are recalled. Although it is not specifically against the excesses of a gentile court setting that God is complaining, perhaps there is an undercurrent of Jewish thought at work which expects bad things to happen in such scenes of dissipation, and sees them as images of human pride.<sup>3</sup> The result is that the opening phrase has an immediate foreshadowing effect, and the negative imagery of the banquet resonates through the chapter.

At the same time the chief concern of both versions is the pride of Belshazzar, not the excess. This is obvious in Θ, which tells of the king that he orders the vessels because 'his heart was lifted up' (v 2, ἀνυψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ). Contrary to the Theodotonic understanding implied by the participle πίνων (v 1), this is not the same thing as being drunk. Rather it carries the idea of deliberate self aggrandizement. The idiom ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία is not uncommon in Septuagintal Greek, although the usage here of the prefixed form of the verb is unique. When it occurs it almost always conveys pride or unhealthy ambition or a false sense of superiority. It usually translates רבה לב or גבה לב or רום לב as for example in Dt 8.14 and 17.20, and Ez 28.5. This contrasts with Esther 1.10, another story of banquets, where the king's action definitely is as a result of the wine. The Hebrew כָּשׁוּב לִב־הַמֶּלֶךְ בַּיַּיִן ('when the king's heart was merry with wine') becomes in the A-text ἐν τῷ εὐφρανθῆναι τὸν βασιλέα ἐν τῷ οἴνῳ (A-text 2.10).<sup>4</sup>

The same can be said for the Masoretic Text although the best way to understand בְּשַׁעַם חֲמֵרָא is contested. One approach is to translate it 'under the influence of wine'. In that case the king is seen acting at a late stage in the banquet when the wine has either impaired his judgement

---

<sup>3</sup>Goldingay, 'The Stories in Daniel', 106

<sup>4</sup>Clines, 218. Θ ἡδέως γεγόμενος is a little more coy.

or bestowed on him an alcoholic courage.<sup>5</sup> His calling for the temple vessels from Jerusalem thereby becomes the final expression of courtly excess. This is the more usual approach to translation and is probably how  $\theta$  understood it with καὶ πίνων (v 1, 'and having drunk...'). The other main approach is that suggested by BDB and taken up by others, that טעם in Daniel 5.2 means the 'tasting' of the wine.<sup>6</sup> On this reasoning, Belshazzar's action, at whatever point in the banquet it may have taken place, could be understood as a kind of libation, a calculated action the motivation for which will need to be considered later.

Both usages of טעם are problematic however. The word occurs in Biblical Hebrew where its primary meaning relates to physical taste, in the sense of eating something in small quantities (for example, 1 Sam 14.24, 2 Sam 3.35). This leads to the idea of tasting something to test it, and from there to a more general concept of exercising discernment or judgement. The parallelism of Job 12.11, where בִּחֵן ('test, examine') and טעם explicate each other, neatly illustrates this broadened sense. By the time of Biblical Aramaic the core meaning is still found in the verb form, where טעם is used to describe Nebuchadnezzar being fed like a domestic animal (4.22 and 29, and 5.21). But the noun form has left that sense long behind and usually means a command or decree or report, the issuing of some sort of formal document or utterance. The difference is illustrated by the play on both senses in Jonah 3.7, where the king and his nobles issue a 'decree' (מִשְׁעָם) commanding the people, 'do not taste' (אל-יטעמו) food. The earlier nuance of taste as discretion can still be detected in the idiom, שִׁים...טעם על (Dan 3.12 and 6.14) meaning to 'have a proper regard for' or to 'pay attention to'. By the time of the Targums the verb form still refers to physical taste, but the noun has come simply to mean 'good sense, wisdom or reason'.

The upshot of all this is that the suggested translation, 'at the

---

<sup>5</sup>That is how Hartman and DiLella, 181, see it.

<sup>6</sup>RSV for example. Bentzen, *Daniel*, 23, detects the 'antiker Sitte' of libation but offers no ancient sources in support. See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 251, for a discussion of this point.

tasting of the wine', is unlikely as it entails an anachronistic understanding which would be the only example of such a usage in either Biblical Aramaic or later Aramaic. On the other hand the development of the meaning of טעם makes it unlikely that a complete loss of judgement on the part of Belshazzar is intended. I suggest an understanding that steers between the two extremes of courtly excess and formal libation. This can be done by retaining the translation 'under the influence of wine' as long as the dual connotation of the English wording is understood.<sup>7</sup> Whether or not טעם denotes a formal ceremony of some sort, it is unlikely that Belshazzar's action simply shows that he was drunk. טעם tells the reader that he was still exercising judgement, albeit faulty, and so retaining a measure of responsibility for his actions. This has consequences for how the nature of Belshazzar's sin should be understood. At the same time it serves as a further resonance of the negative banquet imagery in the background of the story. There is also an element of irony at work. As Nebuchadnezzar was fed grass, so Belshazzar his son is fed wine. As other kings issue commands and receive reports, this king's adviser is his wine. Herein lies an early hint that Belshazzar is being unfavourably compared with other monarchs.

But there are also differences in the banquet setting. The Masoretic Text implies some sort of formal occasion, with the king presiding. That implication comes through in several ways. It is found in the description of the guests as 'his nobles' (v 1, רב־בְּנוֹתָי), who are clearly official figures. The word does not occur in Biblical Aramaic outside Daniel, and within Daniel it is principally in this chapter. It is also applied to the officials who accompanied Darius to the mouth of the lion pit and with him affixed their seals to the stone (6.18).

As well as the nobles there are also women present, שְׂלֵחָה and לְחֵנָה, usually translated in English as 'wives and concubines' (vv 2f, 23). The exact status of these women is unclear, but neither term has complimentary overtones. The difference between them is possibly one of

---

<sup>7</sup>That sense is captured by Rashi whom Gallé, 53, translates with 'conseil'. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 76, follows Rashi. See also Fewell, 185n.

degree rather than kind, and both groups would have been members of the royal harem.<sup>8</sup> The presence of women at official banquets in the Medo-Persian empire is well-attested, and 1 Esdras 4.25ff contains a delightful sketch of their role on such occasions. The word that Esdras uses for 'concubine' there, *παλλακή*, is the same one that *Θ* uses to translate *שגל* in v 2. The other word that *Θ* uses, *παράκοιτοι*, makes clear the limited functions of these women. Like the king's officials, the women are there because they belong to the king. The guests are all described in terms of their relationship to Belshazzar.<sup>9</sup>

The phrase 'before the thousand' (v 1, *לִקְבֵּל אֶלְפָּה*) is also important. It provides a clue as to the possible layout of the banquet hall. There are a group of women present in the hall, not included in that description, yet the account is clear that they participate in what follows. If the picture in 1 Esdras mentioned above is of any significance, such members of the harem who were present would have been seated near the king, and like him, facing the thousand guests. It also emphasizes the public nature of what is about to happen. The entire scene with its consequences for Belshazzar is enacted in front of the thousand.<sup>10</sup> What begins as a public exhibition of bravado ends in public humiliation. The word *קָבַל* has another important function in the story which I discuss later in connection with the double focus of the narration.

By describing the guests in terms of their functions, and the layout of the banquet in terms of the position of the king, MT depicts an official and formal occasion. In *Θ* the scene of the action is more in the nature of a private party. Rather than a group of royal officials, Belshazzar puts on a feast for an unspecified number of his friends or compatriots or associates (v 2, *ἐταίροις*).<sup>11</sup> There are no women present

---

<sup>8</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 76

<sup>9</sup>Fewell, 135

<sup>10</sup>See Porteous, 78, on the layout of the banquet hall.

<sup>11</sup>Although note the number 2,000 in the Septuagintal prologue.

apart from the queen, who plays an important role in both stories. It is a private gathering of friends and the formality hinted at in the description of the king facing a crowded hall is not present. Moreover once the mysterious hand has done its dreadful work, the response of those at the feast is much more that of equals. They 'clamoured round' (v 6, ἐκαυχῶντο) making a drunken noise in consternation at what is happening to the king.<sup>12</sup> In v 23 these intimates are referred to by Daniel as 'your friends' (τοῖς φίλοις σου) in the same breath that he calls them 'your nobles' (οἱ μεγιστάνες σου), a word which carries similar literal connotations to the Aramaic ܠܗܪܒܢ. It is not surprising that the companions of Belshazzar are the 'greats' of the land, but the emphasis is not so much on their position as on their intimacy with the king. It is in the context of that private drinking bout that the ensuing events happen.

### the sin of Belshazzar

Before proceeding further in this exploration, it would be helpful to clarify what exactly the sin is for which Belshazzar is condemned. It is almost the same in both stories, notwithstanding the differences in the king's motivation and fate between versions. The sin begins in his pride. In MT this resulted in his misguided attempt to exercise טעם (v 2), a concept expanded on by Daniel who reminds him, 'you lifted yourself up' (v 23, הִתְרומַם). The 5 narrator coincides with the Aramaic sense earlier in his story with the phrase ἀνυψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ (v 2, 'his heart was lifted up'). At this point in both narratives the results of his arrogance are judged in similar terms, but the sin does not lie in possession of the sacred vessels.<sup>13</sup>

Nebuchadnezzar himself, who has just been mentioned in approving tones (MT vv 20f), was condemned for his pride alone, not for possessing

---

<sup>12</sup>The prefix on συνεταῖροι (v 6) may imply an increased intimacy or concern, or it may be introduced by the translator for variety.

<sup>13</sup>Both versions remind us of the propensity of Nabonidus to collect foreign deities. See Shea, 'Daniel 5', 282.



the items out of the Jerusalem temple. But the sin of his successor's pride is two-fold. In the first place he desecrates the vessels by using them at the banquet. In the second place he praises other gods and neglects the living God. It is unclear in both versions whether these two things are distinct in the mind of the narrator, or whether they represent one action. What is clear is that a deliberate act of defiance is taking place.

### the king's motivation and fate

One result of the small differences in setting is that they suggest different motivations for the king's actions. In the Septuagint the events that take place are in a less official setting, appropriate to Belshazzar's personal rebellion against God. In MT he appears to be engaging in a deliberate act of public rebellion. This ties in with the different fate suffered by the king in each version. The narrator of the Masoretic Text remains content with the result that 'Belshazzar...was killed' (v 30, קטל בלשצר).<sup>14</sup> The stark ending of MT is more muted in the Septuagint and the fate of the king is not so final. There the judgement that comes is that 'the kingdom was taken from the Chaldeans' (v 30, τὸ βασίλειον ἐξήρται ἀπὸ τῶν Χαλδαίων) and given to the Medes and Persians. The loss by Belshazzar of his kingdom is only implied. At this climactic point in the narrative the ὁ story teller is more interested in the fate of the kingdom, whereas the emphatic 'in that night' (v 30, בַּלַּיְלָא) of MT indicates a concern to link the sin of the king with his personal fate. At first glance it may seem strange that the MT account of public rebellion emphasizes personal consequences while the ὁ account of personal rebellion emphasizes public outcome. This interest in the sin of the king as an issue of personal allegiance, and the fate of his kingdom as an outcome of his choices, is typical of the Septuagint's treatment of the monarchs in other Daniel stories. As we will see, the

---

<sup>14</sup>The historicity of this incident is much debated. In connection with his view of Belshazzar as chief officer of Nabonidus, Shea, 'Belshazzar', 68, applies the evidence in *Herodotus* I.191 and Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VII.v.26f, of a feasting king killed by the Persians to the king in Daniel 5.



emphasis of the Masoretic Text relates to the MT interest in the political motives of Belshazzar that lie behind the events of the banquet.

Fewell links Belshazzar's motivation in MT to the absent presence of Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>15</sup> She argues that the banquet was intended to demonstrate Belshazzar's independence of his father, Nebuchadnezzar. The appellation of the latter as the present king's father raises issues which merit a brief comment at this point. It is known that Belshazzar was in fact the son of Nabonidus, no blood relation of Nebuchadnezzar but his usurper. There is a tradition that Belshazzar was related to Nebuchadnezzar through his mother but it does not bear much weight.<sup>16</sup> One explanation may be that ch 4 was originally about Nabonidus, and the references in ch 5 to an earlier king were also once to Nabonidus.<sup>17</sup> In that case the king of ch 5 is indeed the son of the king of ch 4. Another possibility is that this chapter echoes a court fiction designed to emphasize the continuity of the regime and legitimate the introduction of outside blood. In those terms Nebuchadnezzar was Belshazzar's 'father'. It is not essential to my present purpose to declare on this matter, for the story works the same in any case. Belshazzar may be the son of a successful father attempting to declare his independence and to come out from under his father's shadow, or he could be an insecure member of a usurping regime seeking to demonstrate his legitimacy. In either case he is troubled by the memory of Nebuchadnezzar and this story as told in the Masoretic Text may be partly understood in those terms.

The first hint of that is found early in the story in a variation

---

<sup>15</sup>Fewell, 118ff

<sup>16</sup>Wiseman, *Nebuchadnezzar*, 11f, takes seriously the possibility of Belshazzar being the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar through his mother. His father Nabonidus would therefore have been the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar. Millard, 'Daniel 1-6', 72, warns that this 'remains speculation'.

<sup>17</sup>See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 108, for a discussion of this point. The argument for Nabonidus being the earlier referent of ch 4 also relates to the question of the four kingdoms.

within repetitive statements, a device beloved of biblical narrative.<sup>18</sup> In v 2 Belshazzar orders the vessels to be brought which 'Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken from the temple which is in Jerusalem' (תנפק נבוכדנצר אביו מן-היכלא די בירושלם). In v 3 the vessels brought in response to this order are those 'from the temple which is the house of the God who is in Jerusalem' (מן-היכלא די-בית אלהא די בירושלם), with no mention of the king's father. The careful reader is thus alerted to the fact that, at least as far as Belshazzar is concerned, Nebuchadnezzar has some importance to the ensuing narrative.

A further clue comes with the king's curious ignorance of Daniel's existence, and diffidence towards him once he learns of it. This is hinted at in several ways. His description of Daniel in v 13 as one of the 'sons of the exile of Judah' (בני גלותא די יהודה) is beside the point and so perhaps slightly derogatory. Daniel's Judean origins did not feature in the queen's introduction of him but Belshazzar chooses to emphasize them.<sup>19</sup> At the same time he does not use the Chaldean name, Belteshazzar, which had been conferred on Daniel by Nebuchadnezzar. This is a name that the queen uses and that Nebuchadnezzar used quite frequently when addressing Daniel. The present king, in contrast to the queen, prefers to remember Daniel's non-Babylonian origins rather than his function in his father's court, and his Judean name rather than the

---

<sup>18</sup> Alter, 66

<sup>19</sup> It does not matter whether מלכתא, 'the queen', is the mother or wife of the king. Persian and Babylonian sources both know of powerful women playing a political role at court either as mother or wife of the monarch. This is a role distinct from that of chief consort. Her dominance, freedom of movement and knowledge of the past suggest that the queen of this story is such a political figure, more likely to be the mother than the spouse of Belshazzar. Compare the restrictions placed on Vashti and Esther. Lewy, 414ff, discusses the role of Sumna-damqa, the Assyro-Babylonian vice-queen in connection with Nabonidus and the cult of the moon god. See also Montgomery, *Daniel*, 258, and Oppenheim, 104. The Greek βασίλισσα, also used of Esther and Vashti by both G and the A-text, is as ambiguous as the Aramaic. I use the term 'queen' to denote this figure of influence at the court without defining her exact relationship to the king. Brenner, 18f, discusses the rarer occurrences of such figures in Israelite culture. See also Delcor, *Daniel*, 128.

one given him by a predecessor.<sup>20</sup> To use that name would be to admit his Babylonian significance.

Belshazzar's implicit attitude becomes explicit in two other carefully turned phrases in his address to Daniel. He reminds Daniel that he was one whom his father 'brought from Judah' (v 13, *היה... מן-יהוד*). This contrasts with the queen's speech where King Nebuchadnezzar is said to have 'set him up' (v 11, *הקים*).<sup>21</sup> By so referring to Daniel Belshazzar reduces him to a level with the temple vessels, which had also been brought out of Judah (vv 2f). He also adds a rider, 'I have heard concerning you' (vv 14 and 16, *שמעת עליך*), to his remarks. This contrasts with Nebuchadnezzar's 'I know that...' (4.6, *אנה ידעת די*). Belshazzar does not accept anything about Daniel at face value other than that he was brought into exile, a fact that is mentioned before the rider.

Many commentators have wondered why the king should not have known about such a prominent sage as Daniel had become, particularly in the light of the knowledge that his aforementioned speech betrays.<sup>22</sup> Goldingay suggests it is not so surprising.<sup>23</sup> The historical argument that Daniel by this time would have been an old man and perhaps had not been active during the reign of Belshazzar stretches credibility, particularly in light of the role he proceeded to play in Darius' administration. The literary and psychological arguments are more convincing. In literary terms the story satisfies many of the requirements for a court contest. Daniel enters the scene last through the intervention of another person, in this case the queen. However

---

<sup>20</sup>Young, *Daniel*, 123. Shea, 'Belshazzar', 74, considers that the king avoids Daniel's Babylonian name because it is the same as his own. The Septuagint reflects this.

<sup>21</sup>See Savran, 6f and 109f, on repetition in dialogue. He notes that Daniel here contrasts with Esther and Jonah, other examples of later texts, which employ less repetition. See further Sternberg, 'Proteus', 108ff, on quotation.

<sup>22</sup>For example Lacocque, *Daniel*, 82.

<sup>23</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 110

another requirement of the genre is that the hero be a previously unknown figure, yet the queen's words establish Daniel as someone with previously recognized credentials.<sup>24</sup> The story now looks more like a court conflict, although there is no punishment of conspirators.<sup>25</sup> In that respect a rigid genre distinction breaks down, and the explanation of Belshazzar's non-recognition of Daniel as a function of literary genre is thereby problematic. It could equally be understood in psychological terms. Belshazzar does not choose to remember Daniel for reasons that we have already considered. The narrator conveys this through the differences between what the queen has to say and what Belshazzar seems to know about Daniel. He would not have been part of this king's administration for political reasons and was only called in as a final desperate resort by Belshazzar, who was given no option by the queen.

The setting of the story in the Septuagint creates a different dynamic. Because it is a private occasion it remains essentially a private matter between God and the king. The other characters exist in order to facilitate that encounter and Nebuchadnezzar is not the dominating absentee to the same extent, although ⑤ does recognize the tradition that he was Belshazzar's father. In the two places where he is mentioned in the Septuagint account his significance in relation to Belshazzar is downplayed. In v 2 the word order differs from MT. The vessels are from the house of God firstly and the fact that they were taken by his father from Jerusalem is incidental. Because v 3 does not have the repetition that MT contains, there is no opportunity at this point in the ⑤ narrative to observe any ambivalence about his predecessor on the part of the king. The only MT occurrence of Daniel's Babylonian name, Belteshazzar, occurs in a plus (v 12b), so does not feature at all in the Septuagint.

In vv 11f the queen reminds the king of Daniel, who did his work in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. As with the first example given, ⑤ handles

---

<sup>24</sup>Zerubbabel in 1 Esdras 3-4 exemplifies such an unknown figure.

<sup>25</sup>See again Humphreys, 217f, on the distinction between court conflict and court contest.

the narrative differently. In the Septuagint Daniel's qualifications as a wise man are given greater prominence than the description of his activities in the court of the late king. In this case there is no counter speech from Belshazzar hinting that he demurs from that opinion of Daniel. His motivation is not given the same sort of political significance as that accorded it by the MT narrator.

### characters

The differences in Belshazzar's motivation portrayed by the two narrators is a crucial difference between the two accounts. This may be brought out more clearly by considering the differences in portrayal of two other characters in the story, Daniel and the queen, along with a further look at the character of Belshazzar.

In the court contest form the protagonist is usually introduced to the king by some sort of intermediary figure. On one level this is the function of the queen in bringing Daniel to Belshazzar's notice. Arioch in ch 2 served the same purpose.<sup>26</sup> But unlike the intermediary Arioch, who approaches Nebuchadnezzar with great apprehension, the queen of the Masoretic Text betrays no hint of fear as she strides in and takes centre stage. By allowing her to leave her role as a functionary, the narrator epitomizes Belshazzar's problem. He does not feel he is his own boss. After issuing her advice the queen simply commands, 'Now let Daniel be called' (v 12, כען ויאל דקרי).<sup>27</sup> To whom is this command addressed? The king or those under the king's orders? The structure of the narrative suggests the queen has bypassed the king entirely and issued orders to his subordinates herself. The use of בארין in v 13 supports this view of the queen's role. The word is almost always used in Aramaic Daniel immediately after direct speech or some particular action of a character or characters, and introduces action directly consequent on what precedes it. It almost always occurs at the beginning of the verse (See 2.14, 35

---

<sup>26</sup>Milne, 225. Compare also the role of the chief cupbearer in the story of Joseph (Gen 41.9ff).

<sup>27</sup>A jussive form. See Rosenthal, 44.

and 46; 3.3, 13, 19, 21 and 26; 4.4; 5.3, 17 and 29; 6.13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24 and 26).<sup>28</sup>

Apart from her attitude towards the king, what the queen has to say to him is important. The first time she speaks she reminds the insecure regent of a man who distinguished himself 'in the days of your father' (v 11, **בְּיוֹם אָבִיךָ**) and whom 'King Nebuchadnezzar your father set up' (v 11, **מֶלֶכָא נְבֻכַדְנֶצַּר אָבִיךָ...הָקִימָהּ**).<sup>29</sup> To round the speech off, and just in case Belshazzar has missed the references to Nebuchadnezzar, she adds the syntactically redundant phrase 'your father the king' (**אָבִיךָ מֶלֶכָא**) to force the point home.  $\Theta$  does not include this phrase as it comes at the end of a block of MT plus material (v 11b). It is omitted in  $\theta$  by a translator who recognized its redundancy, and perhaps failed to appreciate its emphatic role in the direct speech of MT. The placement of **הָקִימָהּ** at the end of the phrase, and in juxtaposition to the extra reference to the king, reinforces the link between Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar.

Minor characters often seem to appear and disappear in Old Testament narrative without any attempt on the part of the narrator to set them in context or give them an identity, but they bring some twist or surprise element into the story in support of the narrator's purposes.<sup>30</sup> The queen is functioning in such a way here. In this case her unbidden entry alerts the reader that there is something going on. Her defiance of convention reinforces the picture of Belshazzar's insecurity.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>The distinction between **כִּי** and **וְ** as narrative connectives is blurred but the latter, as it is used in Daniel, possibly indicates a slightly less causal relationship with what precedes it. See for example the instances in ch 6 (vv 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 15, 19 and 22). But in commenting on 2.14, Charles, *Daniel*, 34, says the prefixed form marks a new section or paragraph. He draws the distinction too boldly.

<sup>29</sup>4QprEsthar-d, ll 2-4, also contains an account of a queen who enters Balthasar's hall unannounced and tells of a Jew who might help. See the edition of Milik, 'Les Modèles Araméens', 336f, 342 and 378.

<sup>30</sup>Simon, 13

<sup>31</sup>Simon, 18: 'The minor character is...instrumental in the ironic reversal of social conventions'. Miscall, 57, reminds us of the



In literary terms the 𐤒 queen does not function as an intermediary in the way that she does in MT. She enters only when the king 'called' (v 9, ἐκάλεσε) her. Moreover, when she speaks her attitude is a more conciliatory one. She merely 'reminded' (v 10, ἐμνήσθη) Belshazzar of the presence of Daniel and does not herself command that he should be brought forward. Indeed the Septuagint narrative seems to jump at this point from the queen's speech to Daniel's entry (v 13) with no record of him having been summoned, the only place in the chapter where a character makes an uninvited entry. This leap may be a feature of style, similar to the unsolicited entry of Daniel in MT 4.5, or representative of some incompleteness in the tradition. Whichever is the case, it shows another MT plus in the queen's speech (v 12b) containing material which knits the story of Belshazzar to that of Nebuchadnezzar. In the Septuagint, where the 𐤒 narrator is not so concerned with that relationship between the stories, the queen simply serves as a link in the narrative and a purveyor of information about Daniel the wise man.

There are several ways in which the Masoretic Text and Septuagint differ in their portrayal and use of Daniel also. In MT Daniel serves a two-fold function *vis à vis* King Belshazzar. On the one hand he is a symbol of the regime of Nebuchadnezzar, and on the other he brings the judgement of God. In response to the king's request Daniel purports as God's messenger to draw an unfavourable comparison between Nebuchadnezzar's eventual humility and Belshazzar's pride. At a subliminal level the description of Nebuchadnezzar's temporal successes (vv 18f) reinforces the suspicion that some sort of political apologia for Nebuchadnezzar is going on. He reminds the king again of his links with Nebuchadnezzar by recounting the events from ch 4 (vv 18-22). Yet when it comes to spelling out Belshazzar's sin to him (v 23) there is no mention of his predecessor. Instead of facing the representative of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar is suddenly facing God, and at this point the narrator begins to apply Daniel's other function in the story.<sup>32</sup>

---

significance of the unusual in OT narrative.

<sup>32</sup>Fewell, 135



The Septuagint narrative is less ambivalent about the role played by Daniel. This is apparent in the different uses made by each version of the phrase גְּלוּתָא דִּי יְהוּדָא ('exiles of Judah') and its Greek equivalent, ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς Ἰουδαίας. As we have already seen, in MT the king uses it (v 13) in his initial address to Daniel to try and bolster his own position. The phrase in ᠙ occurs as a piece of description from the narrator, indeed the only piece of narrative description of Daniel (v 10). The rest of Daniel's portrait is painted within direct speech. There is no suggestion of any ambivalence on the part of Belshazzar regarding Daniel's qualifications as a sage. The first time he speaks he merely asks if Daniel can interpret, and Daniel's response is to do just that.

Another subtle difference in emphasis regards the agency of Daniel. In the MT account it is only implied that Nebuchadnezzar was ever the beneficiary of Daniel's 'wisdom of the gods' (v 11, חִכְמַת-אֱלֹהִים), but it is explicit that the king 'set him up' (v 11, הִקְמָה). He is clearly a figure identified with the court in the Aramaic version. In the Septuagint the opposite is the case. He exercised his gifts in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, who was the beneficiary of those gifts (v 12), but there is no suggestion that he acted as an appointee of the king. His authority therefore remains intrinsic rather than extrinsic and so poses no threat to the temporal authority of Belshazzar. This different role is appropriate to a version that does not include contest or conflict material, and represents the issues facing the king in spiritual rather than temporal terms.

Consequently, while neither Belshazzar nor Daniel respond to the other with much grace in MT, there is a less adversarial tone to the exchanges between wise man and king in ᠙.<sup>33</sup> There is no record of Daniel declining the gifts in the abrupt fashion that he does in MT v 17. His response is simply to stand before the writing and read it (v 17). He

---

<sup>33</sup> Contrast Montgomery, *Daniel*, 249, who suggests 'The king graciously accosts (Daniel)' in MT. Hartman and DiLella, 189, and Heaton, 160, agree.

does not refer to Nebuchadnezzar at all. Indeed vv 18-22, which enumerate Nebuchadnezzar's achievements and link them explicitly with Belshazzar's failure, do not form part of the Septuagint narrative.

The third character in the story is Belshazzar. In the previous section I considered his motivation, and aspects of his character were brought out in connection with that. But there is more to add on the characterization of Belshazzar in each version. Because of the differing attitudes of the queen and Daniel, the portrait of him in 5 is a more sympathetic one. His influence over the queen, Daniel's polite and immediate response to his request for an interpretation, the absence of a number of allusions to the greatness of Nebuchadnezzar, and the more open-ended conclusion, at least as far as Belshazzar personally is concerned, are all cases in point.

The more negative view of the Masoretic Text comes through particularly in the sense of fear exuded by the king. This is portrayed by the physical manifestations of his terror (v 6), the repetition and intensification of that terror in the phrase 'greatly terrified' (v 9, *שָׁנִיא מְחִבֵּהל*), and the manner in which he calls for his wise men. He 'called loudly' (v 7, *קָרָא... בְּחֵל*).<sup>34</sup> These are all in contrast to the account in 5 and also in contrast to Nebuchadnezzar in the previous chapter, who describes the summoning of his wise men in the authoritative terms of a royal decree (4.3, *כְּצִי שִׁים שְׁעָם*). Enough has already been said in connection with other points to show that this contrast between the monarchs is generally true throughout the chapter.

The charge has been laid against this particular tale that the characters are one-dimensional.<sup>35</sup> It may be true that, 'The narrative reveals little of the distinctive personalities of the characters in the story...', but it should be clear by now that the subtlety of characterization helps to bring out more clearly the agenda of the MT narrator. The king's fear, the appropriation of his authority by the

---

<sup>34</sup>Driver, 63

<sup>35</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 104

queen, and the ambivalence of Daniel's attitude towards Belshazzar all give life to this portrait of a courtly power struggle, which serves as a backdrop to the writing on the wall and its interpretation.

The Septuagint is not so interested in that backdrop but focuses instead more sharply on the handwriting and its interpretation. As a result the characters are less surprising and more functional. The queen simply comes when she is called for and reminds Belshazzar of a wise man from the previous regime. Belshazzar does not exhibit the same fear or loss of control, both moral and physical, and continues to issue orders. Daniel, like the queen, comes and does what he is asked to do. He makes no response at all to the promise of a reward.

### **perspective**

In discussing the character and role of Daniel I have noted a double focus in the story as told by the Masoretic Text narrator. The result is that there is also a story behind the story of the handwriting on the wall. This second strand of emphasis can be elucidated further by considering the operation of perspective in chapter 5.<sup>36</sup>

The two-fold perspective becomes clear in an examination of the use made of the preposition **קבל** (vv 1 and 5). Belshazzar, who drank wine 'before or in front of' (**קבל**) them, thought he was performing his actions facing the guests in the opening sentence of the story. In fact what turned out to be facing (**קבל**) him was the handwriting on the wall (v 5). There is an irony immediately apparent that reflects badly on the king. But the word is also used by the narrator to direct the point of view of the reader, with similar effects to a change in camera angle. Such an effect was also achieved in ch 4 by the shift in narrative person. The narrator first describes Belshazzar facing his nobles, whose attention in turn is directed back towards him. But on the opposite (**קבל**) wall the

---

<sup>36</sup>See again Stanzel, 9, on the functions of point of view. By 'perspective' here I mean primarily the physical standpoint from which the story is narrated, but this also is part of the way the outlooks of different characters and the narrator are conveyed.

fingers of God face Belshazzar. The result is a series of physical manifestations of terror which the nobles observe without being aware of the immediate cause of the terror, the handwriting going on behind them. The reader sees what the nobles see, the terrified king, but not the words that are causing the terror. The fact that the royal harem (v 3, שגללה ולחנה) disappears from the story at that point tends to support my earlier suggestion regarding the banquet lay out. From their position in the hall they would not have witnessed the king's terror. In this way the focus moves away from the handwriting seen by Belshazzar to the frightened king as observed by his guests.<sup>37</sup>

The shift in viewpoint serves two purposes. It puts the handwriting into abeyance so that it is not even read, much less interpreted, until much later in the story. This heightens suspense and reflects the ignorance of the nobles, who probably had not read the writing. It also clears the stage for the other focus of the story, the king's psychological and political struggle against the memory of his predecessor and the consequences of that insecurity for his kingdom. The writing itself does not appear again until v 26. The two points of view in evidence are God's and Belshazzar's. The king thinks he is proving himself in some way at the banquet but God has quite a different attitude towards his misdeeds. What Belshazzar thought he was doing is dealt with in the long, and purposefully repetitive, section in vv 11-22. Daniel, as we have seen, addresses both points of view.

There are clues directing the careful reader to the viewpoint that the narrator himself is backing. We have already seen that the descriptions of the vessels, repeated in vv 2 and 3, are significant. By varying the emphasis slightly the narrator puts his own stress on them as belonging to God rather than Nebuchadnezzar. Immediately the narrator acquires his own persona and gives an ironic aspect to the dismantling of Belshazzar's political ambitions by the queen and Daniel, while the primary matter of the handwriting is put on hold. But the viewpoint of

---

<sup>37</sup>See Porteous, 78, in support of this view on the operation of perspective within the story.

Daniel is identified with that of the narrator when the matter of the temple vessels is returned to in v 23. There Daniel refers to them as 'the vessels of his house' (v 23, **למאציה די ביתה**), adopting the stress applied by the narrator himself in v 3. In this manner the narrator betrays his point of view as close to, if not identical with that of Daniel.

The more personal setting of the 5 feast does not give rise to the same subtleties of shifting perspective. The more stereotypical roles of the queen and the sage, and the absence of variation in describing the sacred objects means that the second focus is not present at all. As a result there is not the same suspense built up around the writing and its meaning, nor is the aspect of comparison with Nebuchadnezzar nearly as prominent.

#### narrative and narrator

This point becomes more obvious in a consideration of the unusually long piece of narration uninterrupted by dialogue at the beginning of the story in both MT and 5. The first 10 verses in MT and the first 11 in the Septuagint are devoted to the events leading up to the entrance of the queen. In the Masoretic Text this long piece of descriptive narrative is highly visual. Belshazzar is facing his nobles, while the hand that appears is opposite him. The vessels are made of gold and silver. The gods are of gold, silver, bronze, iron, wood and stone. The hand writes on the plaster and is opposite the lampstand.<sup>38</sup> The king 'saw' (v 5, **חזה**) the hand at work. The effect on him is observable as physical changes in his body. The one element in that description that is not physical, 'his thoughts terrified him' (v 6, **רעיניה יבהלונה**) is embedded in three other elements that are all physical. Even the promised rewards are the tangible purple robe, gold necklace and

---

<sup>38</sup>This is the majority opinion on the meaning of **נברשתא**. Millard, 'Daniel 5.5', 88ff, has no doubt about the meaning of the word. The uncertainty is over its etymology, which he argues to be Akkadian. See also the discussion in Montgomery, *Daniel*, 255.

authority over a third part of the kingdom (v 7).<sup>39</sup> Compare this to ch 2 where Nebuchadnezzar promises the more abstract 'gifts and rewards and great honour' (2.6, **מתען ונבוכה ויקר שגיא**). Yet in all of this there is one vital visual detail missing, the writing in the plaster of the palace wall, which the wise men of the kingdom 'were not able to read' (v 8, **לא-כהלין...למקרא**).

The block of introductory narrative in the Septuagint version is similarly visual, although its effect is not quite so marked. To start with, the colour and action achieved by repetition in MT is not present to the same extent. The vessels are only described once in vv 2f and the guests, *ἐταίροις αὐτοῦ* (v 2), are also only mentioned once and after that are referred to by pronoun.

The evocative description of v 6, Belshazzar's initial reaction to the sign on the wall, is also handled differently. MT mentions the king's terror as one of four elements in a description of his physical response. The other elements are well-known involuntary manifestations of fear in the human body. The change of facial colour on its own could be interpreted in more than one way, but when allied with the knees knocking together and the humiliating loss of sphincter control can only mean one thing.<sup>40</sup> The watchers at the feast would have deduced the king's fear for themselves, and the narrator intends the reader to do the same.

The narrator is more overt in 5 with the editorially omniscient statement that 'fears and fancies dismayed him' (v 6, *φόβοι καὶ ὑπόνοιαι αὐτὸν κατέσπευδον*). This is preceded by the difficult phrase *ἡ ὄρασις*

---

<sup>39</sup>**תלוי במלכותא** (v 7) could be a reference to rank or it could be the offer of a specific administrative position. Shea, 'Belshazzar', 70, argues that the 'third' rank for Daniel was after Belshazzar and Nabonidus, for whom Belshazzar was chief officer. Dougherty, 68f, assigns the same rank to Belshazzar, but in the reign of Neriglissar. Compare also Goldingay, *Daniel*, 100, and Lacocque, *Daniel*, 77.

<sup>40</sup>Fewell, 120, offers this understanding of **קטרי תרצה משתרין**, which I accept as likely. Research by Wolters, 119ff, backs up her interpretation. Note also the phrase 'loins were loosened' in The Ethiopic Book of Enoch 60.3. See Knibb, *Enoch*, 142.



αὐτοῦ ἡλλοιώθη (v 6), which is probably an attempt at expressing the same phenomenon as יוֹדֵי שְׁנוּי. Some sort of change in the cast of the face seems to be intended by ἥ, perhaps a heightening or loss of colour. The reader of the Septuagint needs the help of the narrator to understand this phrase, as well as the king's subsequent action in standing and looking at the writing (v 6), as manifestations of fear rather than another emotion such as anger or aggression.

The more specific ἀνυψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ (v 2) of Ἑ, as against כִּשְׁעָם הִמְדָּא of MT, also has a bearing on our discussion of narratorial presence. The Septuagintal narrator reveals to the reader the extent of his knowledge by declaring on Belshazzar's motivation. The MT uses a more ambiguous term, leaving the reader to make his own judgement on the course of action that Belshazzar is about to undertake.

### the writing on the wall

I noted earlier that despite all the visual detail the writing itself is entirely missing in MT. What the king sees is 'the palm of the hand writing' (v 5, פֶּס יְדֵה דִּי כְתָבָה) and that is the occasion of his reaction, not the writing itself.<sup>41</sup> There is no mention of his actually reading the writing. When he calls for his mantic officials in v 7 he desires them to 'read' (קֵרָה) as well as 'interpret' (פִּשְׁר). They are able to do neither (v 8), which intensifies the king's fear. When Belshazzar finally calls Daniel he asks for a reading as well as an interpretation (v 16), and that is exactly what Daniel offers to give (v 17). The only time in the chapter when interpretation appears without reading is when the queen, who was not present when the writing appeared first, orders Daniel to be called (v 12).

The writing comes back into the story much earlier in the Septuagint version (at v 17), but even before that it is taken as understood within the narrative of vv 1-10. The mysterious hand is also a source of fear

---

<sup>41</sup>According to Torrey, 'Notes', 276, the narrator uses כִּשְׁעָם to emphasize that only the hand appears, since יָד may include the forearm as well.



in ⑤, but instead of dissolving as he does almost literally in MT, Belshazzar gets up with his companions to have a closer look at the writing (v 6). It is what he sees at that point, the words rather than the phenomenon, that causes him to call for the mantic officials (v 7, τοὺς ἐπαιδοὺς καὶ φαρμακοὺς καὶ χαλδαίους καὶ γαζαρηνοὺς). They come 'to see the writing and...were not able to provide the interpretation' (v 7, ἰδεῖν τὴν γραφήν καὶ...οὐκ ἐδύναντο συγκρῖναι). The implication is that they can read without difficulty but cannot or will not interpret. Through the rest of the chapter in ⑤ all that the king requests is the interpretation. The lack of an interpretation is a source of concern rather than fear to Belshazzar. In MT a new wave of terror hits him when his wise men are not able to perform (v 9), and the suspense of the narrative increases. In the Septuagint his response to their failure is expressed in the more measured phrase, 'then the king called the queen' (v 9, τότε ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκάλεσε τὴν βασίλισσαν), and then he 'showed' (v 9, ὑπέδειξεν) her the sign. Although the reader does not yet know what the writing is, its presence for the characters is presumed.

A major puzzle for commentators of the Masoretic Text has been in the necessity for the words to be read as well as interpreted, and the failure of the Babylonian wise men to do even the first satisfactorily. By now it should be clear that the king's request to read as well as interpret makes sense when considered in the light of the narrator's craft. It is not the narrator's intention that anybody other than Belshazzar should have seen the writing. The moment it appears, the reader's view of events is from where the nobles sit. His likely companions at the top table, the 'wives and concubines' (v 3, שְׁלֵשָׁה וְלִשְׁתָּהּ), at this point disappear from the narrative. The nobles are focused on the king and his terror which seems to lie principally in the phenomenon of the hand which he saw. His desire to have the writing read and interpreted is no doubt in the hope that such an achievement would make the intent of the hand clear, in the same way that Nebuchadnezzar in ch 2 needed to know both the dream and its interpretation. This is all part of the narrator manipulating the reader's perspective from within the narrative.

In contrast the Septuagint narrator shares his omniscience with the

reader, as far as his treatment of the writing on the wall goes. Because the writing is presumed in the Septuagintal account to be clear to all those present, there is no point in having it read. Indeed Daniel does not do so. He simply gives one understanding of the words with the third person singular passives, 'counted, reckoned, taken away' (v 17, ἡρίθμηται, κατελογίσθη, ἐξῆρται). ̳ makes no attempt to transliterate the Semitic words as Theodotion and the prologue do. The interpretation (vv 26-28) is another matter, as the solution given seems to bear little verbal correspondence, except in the first element, to the original reading. Instead of unpointed roots being given a double meaning, the interpretation could only have come through mantic wisdom. This throws some light on the ̳ interest only in the interpretation.<sup>42</sup> Anybody could, and probably had, read the words for themselves and taken Daniel's initial meaning (v 17) from them.

As a further comment on the Masoretic Text treatment of the writing on the wall, an assortment of suggestions have been made as to why the Babylonian astrologers could not have read the writing. Wiseman notes the lack of any exact parallel to this type of writing in other Ancient Near Eastern sources and traces the astrologers' puzzlement to the fact that the writing does not follow any known models, in that it was not linked to a king or dynasty nor did it appear to be a series of number omens.<sup>43</sup> It is also possible that Belshazzar had experienced some sort of vision to which only he was privy, or else he observed some sort of cryptogram which had to be unscrambled before being interpreted.<sup>44</sup> As a

---

<sup>42</sup>The present discussion does not attempt to solve the riddle of why there are four words written in MT but only three interpreted. But we note the debate. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 102, sees the three words of the Old Greek as assimilation towards the interpretation. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 83, also accepts MT as the *lectio difficilior*. Hartman and DiLella, 183, take the opposite tack and say that 𐤠𐤏𐤍 is doubled in MT through dittography. Torrey, 'Notes', 276, likewise sees the extra element as not original. Eissfeldt, 112f, minimizes the difficulty by noting that variation between message and interpretation is a stylistic feature in Daniel.

<sup>43</sup>Wiseman, *Nebuchadnezzar*, 90, cites Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (1924), 94 l 64 and 103 ll 27-29, and Gadd, 'Omens Expressed in Numbers', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21, 55-58.

<sup>44</sup>Compare Alt, 304f.

development of this idea Finkel puts Daniel's interpretation of the inscription in the context of the biblical and rabbinic tradition of 'pesher' (פֶּשֶׁר) as a mode of interpretation.<sup>45</sup> One aspect of this tradition was discernment of the double meaning of words as a clue to their interpretation. It was only the one to whom the פֶּשֶׁר was granted who could see the double meaning. Another biblical example is the play on שֶׁד in Jer 1.11f, where a nominal form receives an interpretation from the participial form of the trilateral root. Goldingay also reminds us that any piece of unpointed text needs to be understood before it can be read aloud.<sup>46</sup> In that sense the interpretation lies in the reading. Daniel is able to apply the consonants in different ways when he eventually does read them, because he understands their significance.<sup>47</sup>

### words and vision

It is interesting that this story about words has such a strong visual element, particularly in the first part of the chapter. Once the meaning of the words begins to be tackled, there is a return to dialogue and words are used to interpret the written message. This is in contrast to the dream tales of chs 2 and 4, where the divine message is conveyed in the visual experiential media of dreams and visions. Indeed Nebuchadnezzar in ch 4 speaks of what he 'saw' (חָזַק), yet the story is almost entirely conveyed in the form of dialogue. In ch 5 the divine message is verbal, but conveyed by the narrator in the visual experiential terms that belonged to the messages themselves in those dream tales of other chapters.

---

<sup>45</sup>Finkel, 359. Horgan, 256, says of 5.26 that דְּנָה פֶּשֶׁר-מִלְחָמָה is a Qumran pesher formula. Eissfeldt, 108, notes the differentiation between reading and interpretation as a feature of pesher in 1QpHab.

<sup>46</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 109

<sup>47</sup>Note also the rabbinic tradition in B.Talmud Sanhedrin 22a that the words were to be read vertically. See also Saadia in Gallé, 59, and Slotki, 45. Rembrandt's painting of Belshazzar's feast reflects that tradition.

There are several other differences between the versions, none large in themselves, but all adding to the picture of theological and literary differences between MT and the Septuagint. Fewell has drawn attention to the word play in the speech of the queen, who in v 12 reminds Belshazzar that Daniel could 'loosen knots' (משדא קשרין). This is a metaphorical use of the phrase of v 6 which describes one of the physical symptoms of the king's fear, 'the knots of his loins were loosened' (קשרי הרצה משתרין).<sup>48</sup> As well as adding to the king's humiliation the phrase confirms Daniel's role in the story as a bringer of judgement. This play on words is absent in 5. In v 6 the phrase is not represented at all and the equivalent in v 12 is more abstract and less picturesque. Theodotion retains the image in Greek with οἱ σύνδεσμοι τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ διελύοντο (v 6), which also has an echo in v 12.

The phrase יידי שנוהי (vv 6 and 9) brings another ironic twist at Belshazzar's expense.<sup>49</sup> As we have seen, this difficult expression has the sense in the present context of some sort of change in the king's countenance, but יי carries the primary meaning of splendour or brightness. The change in facial colour thereby becomes a further symbol of the reduction of Belshazzar's royal splendour. It is no coincidence that the word also describes the greatness of Nebuchadnezzar (4.33), against whom the present king is being contrasted, as well as the splendour of the statue in 2.31.<sup>50</sup> The Septuagint has no equivalent in v 9, and the translation ὄρασις in v 6 focuses on the immediate meaning of the word and so does not include the irony. Theodotion, by contrast, uses μορφή to render יי both here and at 4.36 in an attempt to capture the wider range of meaning of the Aramaic word.

There is a small but possibly significant variation in the story as

---

<sup>48</sup>Fewell, 122

<sup>49</sup>Slotki, 40

<sup>50</sup>Saadia in Gallé, 54, picks up the pun.

told by MT. In v 2 the temple vessels are of 'gold and silver' (כסף וזהב) but the gods that Belshazzar praises are of 'silver and gold' (v 23, כסף וזהב). The linking of these two items in v 23 at the beginning of a list with a maqqeph and the only ׀ in the series suggests that the reversal of order is deliberate. The gold and silver is reminiscent of the statue of ch 2 and Daniel's identification of the gold head of the statue with Nebuchadnezzar, with the implication that what was to come after him would be increasingly inferior. By reversing the order and placing silver at the head of the list, another chance is not passed up of reminding Belshazzar that he is inferior to Nebuchadnezzar as silver is inferior to gold.<sup>51</sup> This is reinforced by the reference in v 3 to the vessels of 'gold' (זהב) which Nebuchadnezzar had brought out. The different emphasis of ̣ is seen in its description of the idols as 'made by hands of men' (v 23, χειροποίητα τῶν ἀνθρώπων). Incidentally, Theodotion in vv 3 and 23 has either read a different *Vorlage* or amended MT to read 'gold and silver'.

Occasionally the Septuagint conveys a different theological emphasis from MT, as for example in the above mentioned v 23 where the Old Greek says that it is 'idols' (εἰδωλα) being praised by Belshazzar and his nobles. In the Masoretic Text it is 'gods' (אלהי). The two versions agree substantially in their description of the living God whom the king has failed to acknowledge and whose sacred vessels he has desecrated. The MT is less clear on, or at least less interested in, whether or not the other gods exist. The Septuagint allows less room for argument with 'made by hands of men' (v 23, χειροποίητα τῶν ἀνθρώπων). This reflects the monotheistic emphasis of the Septuagint as against the Masoretic Text.

A second instance is that ̣ does not refer to Daniel as 'chief (רב) of the magicians...' as he is in MT v 11. In fact the ̣ account has the effect of distancing Daniel from those officials so that he is in a separate category altogether. When Daniel enters the story Belshazzar makes no reference to the failure of the Babylonian wise men, so the

---

<sup>51</sup>Shea, 'Daniel 5', 283

aspect of contest is almost entirely absent. This continues the trend already seen in ch 4, where the same Aramaic title, רב חרשמיא (4.6), is given Daniel by MT, and where the Septuagint in contrast calls him 'ruler of the wise men' (4.18, ἄρχοντα τῶν σοφιστῶν), although the contrast is not as marked here, as 5 continues on to refer to Daniel as 'leader of the interpreters of dreams' (v 18, τὸν ἡγούμενον τῶν κρινόντων τὰ ἐνύπνια). In this manner the Septuagint portrays the uniqueness of the wisdom evident in the Jewish sage.

The order of events in MT vv 7f has worried some commentators.<sup>52</sup> The problem lies in the fact that the wise men seem to come in twice. Belshazzar orders the officials to be brought in (v 7, להעלה). The ensuing use of ענה as response implies that the order has been carried out and they are now assembled to hear the king's speech. At the beginning of v 8 all the king's wise men come in again, which suggests there is some confusion in the text. Against this, ארין may serve a 'resumptive' function here, in which case the first phrase of v 8 could be translated, 'All the king's wise men having come into the hall...'.<sup>53</sup> Such a usage may be detected in Ezra 4.23. Montgomery also notes that עללין is a peal participle form implying continuous action.<sup>54</sup>

Having said all that, some ambiguity remains in the Masoretic Text narrative at this point. There is a similar ambiguity witnessed to by the Old Greek, which also has the magicians coming in twice (vv 7f). In between the two entrances, however, there is a block of plus material in which the king sets forth an ordinance promising rewards to anybody who is able to interpret the writing. As it stands this has the effect of clarifying the order of events and justifying the second entrance of the purveyors of Babylonian wisdom. They come in first in response to the king's summons but fail in their mission. This elicits a more formal challenge from the king, which the same group also responds to and with

---

<sup>52</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 107, for example.

<sup>53</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 101: 'The phrase is resumptive after v 7b, to lead into the statement of the sages' incomprehension...'

<sup>54</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 254



the same result. However it should be acknowledged that, although the textual witnesses are in harmony with each other, there is a hint of conflation about the story at this point in 5. If that is the case, the same ambiguity as in MT remains.

#### links with Daniel 4

There are obvious links in the Masoretic Text with chapter 4. I have argued above that the links drawn are central to one of the purposes of ch 5, namely to compare Belshazzar unfavourably with Nebuchadnezzar. Thematic links such as the kingship of Nebuchadnezzar, the temple vessels, the contest between types of wisdom, interpretation (פֶּשֶׁר), and the role of Daniel at court have already been dealt with.

There are also organic links that may be seen most clearly where verbal correspondences occur. An example is the list of magicians in v 11 which may be compared with the list in 4.4. The series in v 7 is different only in that the first item, חֲרָשִׁים, is absent. Verse 11 has two other turns of phrase strongly reminiscent of ch 4. The first is the title of Daniel as 'chief of the magicians' (רֹבֵעַ חֲרָשִׁים), the same title used for him in 4.6. The second is in the queen's description of the sage as one in whom is 'the wisdom of the gods' (חִכְמַת-אֱלֹהִים) and who has 'an extraordinary spirit' (רוּחַ יָחִידָה). Although the verbal correspondence is not exact, the two phrases together recall the expression 'spirit of the holy gods' (4.5f, רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים קִדְשִׁים). Belshazzar himself uses the term רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים in his address to Daniel (v 14).

The relationship between chs 4 and 5 is strongest and most explicit in the long stretch of MT plus material in vv 18-22, an account of the events of ch 4, which is almost word for word in places. In v 18 the words 'the kingdom and greatness and glory and majesty' (מַלְכוּתָא וְרִבּוּתָא וְיָקָרָא וְהִדְרָא) echo Nebuchadnezzar's boast in 'Babylon the great' (4.27, בָּבֶל רַבָּתָא) and 'the glory of my majesty' (4.27, יָקָר הַדְרִי). The expression 'peoples, nations and tongues' (v 19, עַמִּימָא אֲמִיָּא וּלְשׁוֹנָא) is identical with the group to whom Nebuchadnezzar's letter is addressed (3.31). Verse 21 is very close to 4.22 which summarizes Nebuchadnezzar's



experience and its significance. Every phrase reflects the previous chapter and the key expressions, 'God Most High rules' (שֵׁלֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים עֲלֵיא) and 'whomever he pleases he sets up over it' (לְמַנְדִּי יַצַּבָּה יְהוָה עֲלֵיהָ), are almost identical.

The Septuagint account of Belshazzar and the writing on the wall relates to the dream of the great tree in a different way. The evidence for some sort of organic link between the two chapters is indecisive. On the one hand the unusual phrase 'fancies dismayed him' (v 6, ὑπόνοιαι αὐτὸν κατέσπευδον) also occurs in 4.19, although in that context Daniel rather than the king is the object. On its own ὑπόνοιαί occurs in 4.33b in a sense more akin to that in 5.6. The expression 'the sight of him (Daniel) changed' is employed at both 5.6 (ἡ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ ἡλλοιώθη) and 4.19 (ἡλλοιωθείσης τῆς ὁράσεως αὐτοῦ). The word ὑποδείκνυμι (vv 7, 9, 12, and 16, 'show') is also characteristic of Θ as compared to θ, and is used twice in ch 4 (vv 18 and 37c) as well. In both chapters it has as its object σύγκριμα or σύγκρισις ('interpretation'). The occurrence of πνεῦμα (v 12) is immediately reminiscent of ch 4, yet the phrase that it is part of, πνεῦμα ἅγιον ('holy spirit') is unique in the Greek versions of Daniel.

However other factors offset this already tenuous evidence. As well as the four occurrences of ὑποδείκνυμι in ch 5, the Septuagint uses ἀπαγγέλω ('announce') synonymously three times (vv 7, 8 and 9). In verse 7 the two words occur in parallel. In contrast to ὑποδείκνυμι, ἀπαγγέλω only occurs elsewhere in Daniel Θ in chapter 2. Moreover chapter 5 uses σύγκριμα (vv 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 26, and 30) where elsewhere Θ tends to favour the same word preferred by θ, σύγκρισις (2.4, 5, 6, 9, and 26; 4.18 and 19). In MT the verbal correspondences are most marked when the events of ch 4 are being recalled. If the same phenomenon were evident in the Septuagint it would be in a comparison of 5.11f, where the queen recalls the work of Daniel under a previous regime, with 4.18. Yet there is no such agreement here. The evidence immediately above is to the contrary. What all this adds up to is that it is impossible to detect the type of linguistic links between ch 4 and 5 in Θ that the Masoretic Text displays.

There is a consistency about the content minuses as far as the Septuagint is concerned. As I have already noted, the court contest or conflict is not a factor in either 6 chapter. Although the magicians make an entrance early in the story, the absence of v 15 in chapter 5 means that they are not placed in opposition to Daniel. The more judgemental attitude of the Septuagint towards Nebuchadnezzar is not altered by the events of ch 5. In fact a link is drawn between the sin of Belshazzar and the sin of Nebuchadnezzar with the phrase ἀνυψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ (5.2). This recalls the accusing words of Daniel to Belshazzar's predecessor, 'your heart was exalted' (4.22, ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδία). Certainly Nebuchadnezzar's political greatness and later acknowledgement of the Most High are not recalled. This is in contrast to what we have already seen about the Masoretic Text use of the person of King Nebuchadnezzar. Likewise, the Septuagintal attitude towards Daniel as a member of the court administration is the same in both chapters. Daniel's position within the court is hardly touched on and he is thought of as entirely outside the category occupied by the Babylonian magicians.

The ordering of the stories in P967 means that chs 4 and 5 are separated from one another by the visions of chs 7 and 8. If that does in fact represent an earlier arrangement, the literary effect of chs 4 and 5 as the central point in a chiasm focused on Nebuchadnezzar, is not present. It is not surprising then that the two chapters are more distinct from one another in 6.<sup>55</sup>

### conclusion

There is much that these two accounts of Belshazzar and the handwriting on the wall have in common. They are both set against the unsettling background of a Near Eastern banquet. In both, the excesses of the banquet are not the primary concern of the narrator so much as the sin of rebellion against God by the desecration of his sacred objects.

---

<sup>55</sup>Note Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 199f, on the priority of the P967 arrangement. He surmises that the MT order is part of that version's interest in showing Daniel as a reliable prophet.

Both narrators show, more or less explicitly, the premeditated nature of the king's action in profaning the temple vessels.

But there are differences in the manner in which the story is told. In his portrayal of characters, his manipulation of perspective, and the sensory nature of his narrative, the MT narrator allows the reader to enter into the ambiguity of his story. From within the story he draws the reader to an identification with Daniel and the queen in their perception of Belshazzar. The Septuagint also shares its point of view with the reader, but the more overt omniscience of the  $\mathfrak{G}$  narrator means that both he and the reader remain outside the events.

The handwriting in both stories is central, but in quite different ways as a result of the two types of narrator. In the Masoretic Text the centrality of the writing on the wall is emphasized by its absence, and in the Septuagint by its presence. The gap created in the MT story, as well as providing suspense, allows the narrator to imply an extra dimension to Belshazzar's motivation. This is where the theme of Nebuchadnezzar's kingship is expounded at Belshazzar's expense, a theme that  $\mathfrak{G}$  only touches on incidentally in the introduction of Daniel, the interpreter of the writing. As a result the Septuagint version has a less negative view of Belshazzar than MT, and views his fate in more personal terms.

There are various literary links with the previous chapter in MT, primarily in the references to King Nebuchadnezzar. In this regard the viewpoint of ch 4 is not only preserved but also developed. The most that can be said for the Septuagint perspective in ch 5 is that it does not contradict that of ch 4. As a result the Masoretic Text has carried on in ch 5 the more complimentary view of Nebuchadnezzar that emerges in the story of the dream of the great tree. Daniel's prominence in the court of Nebuchadnezzar is also confirmed. The story of the handwriting on the wall does not stand alone in  $\mathfrak{G}$ , as we will see when exploring chs 2 and 3, but is largely independent of ch 4. It does, however, show the same Jewish suspicion of Gentile monarchs, polytheism and mantic wisdom as  $\mathfrak{G}$  ch 4.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DANIEL 6

Daniel 6 differs from both the chapters previously studied. These differences as far as MT is concerned have been described in various ways. In structural terms, chs 3 and 6 seem to form a distinctive bracket around 4 and 5.<sup>1</sup> In terms of genre, the present chapter is a classical court conflict in contrast to the contests in the Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar stories.<sup>2</sup> In morphological terms, a distinction has been drawn between *Märchen* (fairy tale) and *Legende* (legend). According to Müller chs 4 and 5 are fairy tales while chs 3 and 6 are later legends.<sup>3</sup> Each analysis recognizes in its own way that chs 4 and 5 are different from chs 3 and 6 in the role assigned to the hero and in the purpose and background of the stories, although, as we will see and as Müller warns, such distinctions are helpful but must not be applied rigidly.<sup>4</sup> The Septuagint also reflects a change in form, principally in that Daniel is now a member of the official hierarchy, and the aspect of contest, hitherto not present in 5, plays an important part in the present story.

These differences form a backdrop to the present comparison of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Lenglet, 182ff

<sup>2</sup>Humphreys, 217f

<sup>3</sup>Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 338f and 342ff. Milne, 241 and 254ff, also marshals the morphological evidence.

<sup>4</sup>Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 347

two accounts of Daniel in the lion pit. After an acknowledgement that the ordering of events and dialogue are roughly the same in both narrations, I will move on to consider some important differences in narrative technique. The profiles of the narrator within the story will be examined in terms of the linking between scenes, the way motive is conveyed, and the pace of the stories. Then the functioning of irony and suspense within the stories will be compared in some detail. At that point a brief excursus will be necessary to clarify some terms used in the discussion of irony both here and elsewhere in the thesis.

I then turn from narrative technique to theological emphasis. This will be done firstly with a close look at the vocabulary used for prayer or petition in each version. The findings there will lead us into the words of the final encyclical, which not only demonstrate the varying points of emphasis between versions but also point up quite different treatments of the person of King Darius. In the process, a small difference in the portrayal of Daniel will be noted. The questions of narrative technique and theological emphasis are artificial distinctions, and each aspect necessarily intrudes into and helps to clarify discussion of the other. The study will demonstrate that the 6 version of the story is not an unsatisfactory one, and a brief section towards the end will exemplify that.

As with other stories in Daniel, there are historical problems around the person of the king, about which little scholarly consensus has emerged. The situation is not helped by the presence of Artaxerxes in v 1 of the Septuagint.<sup>5</sup> There are also textual questions within and between the versions. It is uncertain how many conspirators there are, how many are finally punished, what the verb **רָגַשׁ** means, or how Bel and

---

<sup>5</sup>See Whitcomb's and Rowley's differing treatments of *Darius the Mede*. Note also Wiseman, 'Some Historical Problems', 15f, and Shea, 'Darius the Mede', 239 and 256. Colless, 123ff, outlines a number of literary characteristics that support Wiseman's identification of Cyrus with Darius, and suggests that these features are a 'harmonizing solution' of a historical problem on the part of the author or redactor of MT Daniel.

the Dragon relates to the versions of Daniel 6.<sup>6</sup> In the Septuagint especially there are occasional signs of incomplete redaction that require acknowledgement. I treat these and other questions only at points in the study where they relate to the literary comparison being undertaken. I also include a section on the nature of Daniel's trial, where a discussion of the *Sitz im Leben* of the chapter brings out and clarifies certain differences between MT and 6 as well as drawing attention to a parallel difference between the two accounts of ch 4.

### linking of scenes

The story opens with Daniel's high position at court and the prospect of further advancement for him. At that point the conspirators hatch a plot to bring Daniel down, and manipulate the king to act in accordance with their designs. Daniel undergoes the trial of a night in the lions' pit, and the morning light brings his vindication. The punishment is then turned on the conspirators, and the king issues an encyclical commending the God of Daniel to his subjects. The ordering of dialogue and narration is almost identical in both accounts and in this highly episodic story the sequence of scenes is approximately the same.

Despite the similarity between the versions in the sequence of scenes, they do not relate to each other in the same way. In MT the episodic nature of the story comes through in the frequency with which אֲדִין or its prefixed form בְּאֲדִין is used. Of the 29 verses in ch 6, no less than 15 begin with one of those two words, which is more than twice as often as they occur in any of the other Aramaic stories in Daniel.<sup>7</sup> A change of scene is always indicated by a form of אֲדִין, except at v 11 where the particle כִּי is used.<sup>8</sup> There are also two occasions when the word introduces a change of speaker within a scene (vv 14 and 22), although the latter case could be exceptional as the speakers are

---

<sup>6</sup>See Wills, 129ff, for one treatment of this last question.

<sup>7</sup>Ch 2, 9 times; ch 3, 9 times; ch 4, twice; ch 5, 8 times; ch 7, 3 times.

<sup>8</sup>Contrast Goldingay, *Daniel*, 34, for whom אֲדִין is equivalent to ׀ in BH.

physically separated from each other. The emphasis in all of these short scenes is on the words and actions of the players. The narrator neither ascribes motives nor presumes any special knowledge. The only verbal links between scenes are found in the ubiquitous **וְאֵלֶּכָּה**, which does not give the reader many clues about the nature of the connections between events. Such connections must be deduced from the words and actions of the characters in the story. This brings a starkness as well as an ambivalence to the narrative.<sup>9</sup>

The delineation between the scenes is more blurred in the Septuagint. In the first place there is no uniformity in the way **וְאֵלֶּכָּה** is represented. The most likely translation would be *τότε*, which **Θ** uses more than half the time to translate **וְאֵלֶּכָּה** in the other chapters noted above. In the present chapter this translation is only used 6 times (vv 7, 13, 19, 22, 24 and 26) while the somewhat weaker *καὶ* is used as often (vv 6, 12, 14, 15, 16 and 20), and *ὅτε* and *δὲ* once each (vv 5 and 17). Once, the link is made by means of a participial clause (v 4). Theodotion also uses *καὶ* 6 times (vv 4, 5, 6, 11, 19 and 22) but uses *τότε* 9 times (vv 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 24 and 26). As often as not **Θ**'s choice does not correspond to that of **Θ**. There is no discernible pattern in the translator's choice between *καὶ* and *τότε* in either **Θ** or **Θ**, and *τότε* is used less frequently here than elsewhere in Daniel.<sup>10</sup> *Τότε* also occurs several times in **Θ** where there is no equivalent in MT (vv 18, 21 and 25). This suggests that the Greek versions do not display the particular stylistic feature that is signified by **וְאֵלֶּכָּה** in the Aramaic.<sup>11</sup>

There are other ways also in which the delineation between scenes is

---

<sup>9</sup>Alter, 158, expresses this phenomenon in biblical narrative thus: '...the biblical narrator knows all there is to know about the motives and feelings, the moral nature and spiritual condition of his characters, but...is highly selective about sharing his omniscience with his readers...'

<sup>10</sup>Herein could be part of the evidence for a case that there is more than one **Θ** translator of Daniel, but the point is not crucial to the present discussion.

<sup>11</sup>This is partly a function of translation out of a paratactic language into a hypotactic one. See Caird, 118.



blurred in 6. One is seen in the first two scene changes. At v 4 the opening words, 'who had authority over all' (ὕπὲρ πάντας ἔχων ἐξουσίαν) is grammatically dependent on what has gone before. Consequently Daniel's appointment as one of three leaders is run together with his ascendancy over even his two peers. The two things are not discrete events as in the MT account. At the beginning of v 5 also, a grammatical link is drawn with the preceding scene. The information that 'the two young men' (v 5, οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι) engage in a plot against Daniel is conveyed in a main clause preceded by the dependent clause, 'But when the king wished to set up Daniel...' (ὅτε δὲ ἐβουλεύσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς καταστήσαι τὸν Δανιηλ). The narrator thus makes an explicit link between Daniel's promotion, detailed in v 4, and the subsequent plot. A similar type of blurring also occurs at v 11. Darius has just ratified his decree. Daniel then opens the window of his prayer chamber. Again the information is preceded by a participial clause, 'having found out about the injunction which he had set up against him...' (v 11, ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ Δανιηλ τὸν ὀρισμὸν ὃν ἔστησε κατ' αὐτοῦ). This has the effect of making explicit that Daniel recognizes the law as directed against him personally. Again the Septuagint narrator has made plain something that MT requires the reader to deduce for himself.

If the preceding examples illustrate a deliberate stance adopted towards his material by the narrator, the MT plus material of v 24 points up a certain clumsiness in the progress of the 6 narrative. At that point the conversation between the king and Daniel at the lion pit concludes. True to form the Masoretic Text orders that Daniel be pulled up, the order is effected, and then the king directs that Daniel's enemies be cast into the now vacant lion pit.<sup>12</sup> The Septuagint never actually releases Daniel from the lion pit. The dialogue between Daniel and Darius begins in the same setting as in MT but all that happens next is that the powerful people who are gathered at the pit observe no harm on Daniel and are promptly thrown in. The release of Daniel is understood. While this may be irritating for one interested in the

---

<sup>12</sup>According to Stefanovic, 'Significant Reversals', 141ff, at one level Daniel is 'a book of significant reversals', which emphasize main points. The fate of the conspirators is one such reversal.

literary shape of the story, it points up the interest of  $\Theta$  in determining who is to blame, and then hurrying on to demonstrate the outworking of that judgement. The men who led the king astray are thrust into the lion pit without any further ceremony and Darius is then free to circulate his confession to the empire. This point is expanded in the section below on the role of Daniel in the story.

The transition from the court to the lion pit between vv 16 and 17 is also a case in point although here the difference is not so clear cut. This arises because the two versions are at variance over the order of events, the only point in the story where such is the case. In MT the king, having failed to gain a reprieve for his favourite, gives the order, Daniel is thrown into the pit, Darius speaks wishing him God's intervention, and finally the stone is put over the mouth and sealed in place (vv 17f). In  $\Theta$  the king speaks wishing Daniel well before he is thrown into the pit and the stone placed and sealed over the mouth. However the order from the king that Daniel be thrown into the pit has occurred much earlier in the narrative at the start of v 15. The result again is a blurring of the lines between scenes. The order of events in vv 15-17 is ambiguous, and it is not clear whether the action of v 17 takes place at the court or by the lion pit. The Masoretic Text's use of  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  shown above gives a more straightforward progress through the narrative. Both these examples and the previous one must be treated with care however. They may illustrate the intent of the  $\Theta$  narrative or its lack of literary craft, but they may also point up the composite nature of this version.<sup>13</sup>

#### ascription of motive

An important effect of the stance taken by the Septuagint narrator is that he habitually explicates the motives that lie behind the actions of the characters. The plotters plot because Daniel has been preferred to them (v 5) and Daniel goes to prayer because he knows the king's edict is specifically directed against him (v 11). But this effect is not only

---

<sup>13</sup>See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 280, on this possibility.

present in the way that the scenes are run together. There are other places in the story where it may be observed. The Septuagint plus material of v 6 explains in full the line of reason sustaining the plotters. There is a reminder again in v 9 that they were trying to catch Daniel out with his praying.<sup>14</sup> When Darius and his nobles seal the pit (v 18), the  $\Theta$  reader has no chance to miss the reason for their action, 'lest Daniel be carried away from them or the king draw him up out of the pit' (ὅπως μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀρθῇ ὁ Δανιηλ ἢ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸν ἀνασπάσῃ ἐκ τοῦ λάκκου). This contrasts with the coy remark in MT, לֹא-תִשְׁנֹא צִבּוֹ בְּדַנְיָאֵל (v 18), roughly translated as 'so that Daniel's situation might not change'. It is left to the mind of the reader to suggest how the situation might change.

There is an ambivalence about motive running through the MT account. This can be seen at v 15 where Darius discovers his courtiers' trick and 'it greatly grieved him' (שָׂגִיָּא בְּאֵשׁ עֲלָיו).<sup>15</sup> It is not made clear what the referent of עֲלָיו is. Is he upset at himself, or the leaders and satraps, or Daniel?<sup>16</sup> The phrase 'concerning Daniel' (עַל דַּנְיָאֵל) immediately following does not declare whether the sense is 'for Daniel's person' or 'about the Daniel situation'. Doubt is thereby cast on the king's subsequent motivation. Is it to rescue Daniel or is it to save his reputation or is it simple revenge? The story leaves the reader to witness the words and actions and settle the question for himself. The Septuagint, by contrast, cannot be misunderstood. The phrase 'the king was greatly distressed concerning Daniel and strove...' (v 15, ὁ βασιλεὺς σφόδρα ἐλυπήθη ἐπὶ τῷ Δανιηλ καὶ ἐβόηθει τοῦ ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτὸν) leaves less room for doubt about the king's motivation. There the king's grief is directly linked with the fact of Daniel being thrown to the lions, and his attempt at a rescue operation does not occur until after the order has been given. Theodotion misinterprets both the idiom בְּאֵשׁ עַל and the phrase שָׂם בִּלְ, so it is possible that part of the reason for the more

---

<sup>14</sup>This is possibly a doublet with v 6. See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 280, who argues that such doublets are evidence of the 'secondary character' of  $\Theta$ .

<sup>15</sup>See Rosenthal, 36, on this construction.

<sup>16</sup>Fewell, 149 and 191n

explicit syntax of 5 is a similar failure to recognize either expression.

The closest the MT narrator comes to ascribing motives to a character is with the hint that Daniel entered his prayer chamber 'when he heard about the writing of the edict' (v 11, כְּדִי יֵדַע דִּי-דְרָשִׁים כָּתַבָּא). The Masoretic Text is at this point more expansive than usual in ch 6 with at least a hint of what is motivating Daniel, but is ambivalent about the level of Daniel's self-awareness in taking the action that he does. The Septuagint makes clear that he knows exactly what he is doing.

### narratorial presence

One result of this attribution of motives, almost as editorial comment, is that the teller anticipates his story as the action unfolds. Similar examples of this narratorial presence in the Septuagint may be found at v 19. In the Masoretic Text account the king returns to his palace from the lion pit, 'then' (v 19, אַרְיָן,) he undergoes a sleepless night, 'then' (v 20, בְּאַרְיָן,) he gets up early and hurries back to the lion pit. The reader remains with the king throughout this sequence. Suspense over what is happening to Daniel is achieved by keeping each scene distinct. The suspense is not relieved until the reader with Darius discovers the events of the night. This method of 'shaping space' is a characteristic of biblical narrative.<sup>17</sup> In the Septuagint account the narrator returns the king to his palace, and then takes the reader with him to the lion pit with the information that God was keeping the lions' mouths closed (v 19). At that point the reader knows more than the king. Then Darius arises, receives his officials, and sets off to see what has happened to Daniel. The purpose is not to comment on inner motivation, as in other examples looked at, but the effect is similar in that the reader shares the omniscience and anticipatory perspective of the narrator whose understanding seems constantly to be running just ahead of events. As well as that, suspense over the fate of Daniel is not a factor in the story and the reader takes a less active role in

---

<sup>17</sup>See Bar-Efrat, 184f, who points out that 'only very rarely do we hear what is happening elsewhere through a messenger'.

perceiving the significance of the action.

Another difference between the versions in the same verse (v 19) illustrates further this aspect of difference in narrative technique. In MT all the verbs used to describe the king's sleepless night are objective. The king 'went' (אָל) and spent the night 'fasting' (טות) and no 'diversion' (דיון) was brought to him and sleep 'fled' (גרת) from him.<sup>18</sup> As with Belshazzar's manifestations of fear (5.6) the reader is left to observe the king and draw his own conclusions. The narrator poses simply as a reporter of facts waiting to be interpreted. In contrast to this the G narrator not only reports the king's movements but confides the inside knowledge that the king 'was distressed' (ἦν λυπούμενος), just as he showed the king's fear in ch 5.

### pace

One of the by-products of the differences in narrative technique is a variation in pace between the two stories. We have noted the episodic nature of MT, and will explore below the effects of a large group of spies moving from scene to scene undertaking an activity described by the verb רגש. The story proceeds briskly almost without a pause until Daniel is in the lion pit.<sup>19</sup> At that point there is a slowing which creates suspense. The story leaves Daniel out of sight and lingers over the tension in the king, the approach to the pit, and the king's speech which is too long for the circumstances (vv 19-21).<sup>20</sup> The tension is broken with Daniel's reply and the story picks up speed again until another pause to hear Darius' final ordinance, after which it dismisses him

---

<sup>18</sup>It is not crucial to the narrative to determine exactly what דיון means, whether it be food or concubines or musicians. The translation 'diversion' reflects the purpose of the noun without committing itself to the exact meaning.

<sup>19</sup>However compare Heaton, 166, and Lacocque, *Daniel*, 92, who see built into the story a contrast between the tranquility of Daniel's roof top and the busyness of the spies.

<sup>20</sup>See Genette, 87, on the speed of narrative as a relationship between duration of time portrayed and length of narrative.

without further ado.

The Septuagint progresses through the story with a little less haste. The linkages between scenes and the occasional pauses to describe a character's state of mind or heart have a slowing effect. Moreover the ̳ narrator provides more background material at the start on Darius, and the events of v 4 are incorporated into the story in such a way as to form part of the description of setting, rather than the first scene or event as is the case with MT. The final verse also is a slightly more leisurely completion of the framework of the story initially set up in the early verses. This narrative framework is discussed below in connection with ̳'s treatment of the person of Darius. One section where the pace does quicken is in vv 18-26, where we have already noted a series of *τότε* sentences occurring in rapid succession.

### irony in biblical narrative

So far in my discussion of the differing narrative forms of the two versions I have dealt with matters that can be readily described. But in order to penetrate a little below the surface of the stories we turn our attention to the more subjective aspect of the tone behind the narrative. For this particular story, the question is raised of irony inherent in the account. Any attempt to identify irony or comedy or absurdity in an ancient text should be undertaken with caution. Even within a contemporary cultural consensus humour or irony is an uncertain thing, let alone across the chasms of time and race and faith. Good's approach is a help in crossing those chasms. According to him irony may be described as 'understatement or a method of suggestion rather than of plain statement'. It is also distinguished by what he calls 'its stance in truth'.<sup>21</sup> Therefore key characteristics of irony are a desire to portray the truth as discerned by the ironist without resorting to direct statement, and a reliance on the reader to discern that portrayal. Good distinguishes between comedy and irony in that although both elicit laughter, ironic laughter is intended to sting. If it does not do so it

---

<sup>21</sup>Good, *Irony*, 31



is merely funny.<sup>22</sup> Invective and sarcasm may also be ironic but tend not to be as they generally make no attempt at ambiguity or narratorial neutrality.<sup>23</sup> When biblical narrative creates ironic situations the result is 'dramatic irony'.<sup>24</sup> Another useful term is 'parody', a form that ridicules by exaggeration.<sup>25</sup> 'Caricature' is a kind of parody and is a word that crops up in connection with parody from time to time. Although parody is not necessarily ironic and may be thought of as a type of sarcasm, we will see that part of the ironic tone of Daniel 6 is achieved through parody. I use the word 'humour' occasionally as a catch-all to cover the cluster of concepts just delineated.

### **'a cheerful haggadic tone'**

In light of the above distinctions and of the covert omniscience of the MT narrator, this thesis prefers the term 'irony' to 'comedy' in describing one aspect of the narrative art in Daniel especially notable in chs 6 and 3. The view that there is a measure of irony in the story of Daniel in the lion pit is not without precedent. Avalos makes a strong plea for a comedic function in Daniel. He uses slightly different terminology from Good but his concept of the comedic is close to what Good calls ironic. Deriving his views from Henri Bergson, Avalos defines comedy as a 'mode of discourse which provides social critique, exposes weaknesses in its target, and elicits laughter in the process'.<sup>26</sup> Within that framework he suggests that the repetition of the lists of ch 3, both administrative and musical, have an important comedic function.<sup>27</sup> The movement of the large group of plotters has a similar effect in the chapter presently under discussion. Indeed the list that the officials

---

<sup>22</sup>Good, *Irony*, 26

<sup>23</sup>Good, *Irony*, 26f

<sup>24</sup>This is the term used by Bar-Efrat, 125.

<sup>25</sup>Good, *Irony*, 27f

<sup>26</sup>Avalos, 582

<sup>27</sup>For Avalos the views of such as Lacocque, *Danieli*, 88, who sees a liturgical effect in the lists, do not go far enough.



provide at their audience with the king (v 8, סגניא ואחשדרפניא הדבריא ופחוחא) is close enough to the list of ch 3 (3.2, 3 and 27) to recall the effects of those lists. The four elements are the first four in each of the ch 3 lists, albeit with the order of the first two reversed. The item הדבריא also occurs once in ch 3 (v 27), and it is possible that it is a variant of גרבריא.

Whether or not a reader is able to go as far as Avalos, in general terms the 'cheerful haggadic tone' of this MT story has long been felt.<sup>28</sup> The point is important because the presence or otherwise of such a tone has a bearing on textual as well as literary conclusions. Take for example the question of how many plotters there are: two leaders as in 5 or 120 satraps and two leaders as in MT? The answer arrived at is to some extent determined by the critic's reading of the tone of MT. To illustrate the point, a summary of the different arguments is in order.

There is little room for manoeuvre in this question as far as MT is concerned. The early part of the story is explicit. The aggrieved group at the start seems to include both leaders and satraps. In v 4 we read that Daniel 'overshadowed the leaders and satraps' (מתנצת על-סרכיא ואחשדרפניא), the implied reason for Darius's intention to promote him. Immediately 'the leaders and satraps' (v 5, סרכיא ואחשדרפניא), the same group overshadowed by Daniel, begin to look for grounds of complaint (עלה) against Daniel. It is the same group again who go to the king in v 7, and the referent of 'these men' (v 6, גבריא אלך) is clearly סרכיא ואחשדרפניא. The list of conspirators in v 8 is slightly different, with a particular literary function that we have noted above, but again it must include the expanded group. For the rest of the account the conspirators who spy on Daniel and approach Darius are simply גבריא אלך ('these men', vv 12 and 16), which recalls the reference in v 6 and the group that it is describing. To round off the story, the same group are pitched into the pit (v 25) along with their families. It is inescapable that those plotting against Daniel in MT are the larger

---

<sup>28</sup>Derrett, 133. Delcor, *Daniel*, 133, uses the expression 'un récit haggadique'.

group, and nowhere do the two leaders have any sort of identity in contradistinction to the satraps.

The situation is not so clear cut in the Septuagint. The account is different in that the two others appointed with Daniel are distinguished by the Θ narrator throughout. It is not clear who is intended by πάντας in the phrase ὑπὲρ πάντας ἔχων ἐξουσίαν (v 4, 'having authority over all') but it seems likely to include the 127 satraps (v 2) as well the men set over them (v 3). Later in the verse Daniel is said to be over both groups but both groups are enunciated separately. This prepares the way for v 5 which shows a plot motivated by Darius' favouritism of Daniel. But here it is clear that the plotters are 'the two young men' (οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι). In that context the following οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκεῖνοι ('these men', vv 7 and 13), as well as the use of the third person plural throughout, probably refers to these two conspirators even though the Aramaic equivalent, גבריא אלה, has a wider group in mind. Θ is quite specific also at the end of the story that there are only two victims of the revenge punishment, 'these two men' (v 25, οἱ δύο ἄνθρωποι ἐκεῖνοι).

Commentators have largely failed to notice, however, that the king strives to rescue Daniel not from the two men but 'from the hands of the satraps' (v 15, ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν σατραπῶν). They are the same group who went with the king to the lions pit in the morning (v 20) and at least a section of the group represented as 'all the powers' (v 24, πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις). The situation is further confused by a still different group, 'his nobles' (v 18, τῶν μεγιστάνων αὐτοῦ), called in to witness the sealing of the pit. Cassin, as we see below, has made a useful distinction between the functions of the courtly officials as against the administrators of regions of the empire, and suggests that it is the former who exercise a legal function when Daniel is cast into the pit.<sup>29</sup> Yet it is the latter who are plotting against their colleague. This does not clarify why the satraps are implicated in the later stages of the story, nor who the 'two young men' of v 4 might be. Montgomery sees in this confusion a variety of sources while Schmidt does not acknowledge a

---

<sup>29</sup>Cassin, 141

problem.<sup>30</sup> It is also possible that this phenomenon partly reflects the fact that a later redactor or translator has lost the distinctions between terms that would have applied in the earlier eastern diaspora provenance of the story.<sup>31</sup>

Differing conclusions have been drawn from these variations between versions. As is often the case, Charles and Montgomery represent the two main views. Montgomery considers that ⑤ is merely confused, while Charles would see an earlier story of two plotters underlying the interpolated version that has been preserved.<sup>32</sup> The latter's feeling is that the MT story is unsatisfactory in its present form because so large a group could not possibly have spied on Daniel, or had repeated audiences with the king, or all been devoured by the lions before hitting the bottom of the pit. Therefore the seeds of a story with two conspirators detected in ⑤ must be the *Ursprung*.<sup>33</sup> Such a viewpoint assumes the story of Daniel in the lion pit ought to emit a tone of sober fact, and does not do it very well.<sup>34</sup> Text-historical conclusions are arrived at to fit that assumption.

### parody

If, however, a reader is open to the ironic possibilities of a text, and is not committed to the view that a text with less plotters is necessarily more satisfactory than one with more, the presence of a

---

<sup>30</sup>See the debate between Montgomery, 'The Two Youths', 316f, and Schmidt, 6.

<sup>31</sup>Compare Seeligmann, 82, who detects the same phenomenon in ⑤ Isaiah. See Anderson, 31, on Persian administrative terms. McCrystall, 201, notes that no such problem occurs with the terms for mantic officials, which suggests to him that they were better known in the world of the second century BCE.

<sup>32</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 152, and Montgomery, 'The Two Youths', 317

<sup>33</sup>Similar views are held by Schmidt, 7, and Wills, 144. In contrast, but based on a similar reading of the tone of the story, Porteous, 89, sees ⑤ as a later attempt to cope with the 'fantastic' in MT.

<sup>34</sup>See for example Anderson, 67.

number of conspirators can be seen as evidence of caricature or parody.<sup>35</sup> He is then in a position to appreciate the patent absurdity of this large group of officials crashing on and off stage expecting that nobody could know what they are up to. The absurdity lies in the knowledge of the reader, the ignorance of a king blinded by his pride, and the lack of awareness on the part of the plotters that Daniel and the law of his God still hold the upper hand, all compounded by the size of the group.

This effect is conveyed through the recurring use of the verb רגש (vv 7, 12 and 16) to describe the officials' movements. This verb clearly troubled the Greek translators. Θ renders it 'they approached' (v 7, προσήλθοσαν) or 'watched' (v 12, ἐτήρησαν). The variant account of v 16 avoids translating it at all. Theodotion is similarly uncertain as to its meaning. Its primary meaning seems to be the idea of 'thronging' or 'causing a tumult'. The word does not occur elsewhere in Biblical Aramaic, but 'to throng' or 'to cause a tumult' is its most obvious meaning in Biblical Hebrew (Ps 2.1 and 64.3 for example). Moreover that remains the predominant sense in Targumic Aramaic. The translators were confronting the same problem worrying modern commentators that such a meaning does not appear to fit all three contexts in which the teller of ch 6 uses it: twice at court before the king and once in between as part of their spying on Daniel.<sup>36</sup> This does not seem sufficient warrant in itself to abandon the primary meaning of the word. On the contrary it can be seen as deliberate artifice adding to the tone that is being created by MT, and is an important element in the caricature of the officials. The parody is enhanced by the inappropriate use of רגש in v 12.

---

<sup>35</sup>Lest we think such an approach to Scripture is a modern one, note the career of Bar Kappara the humourist (B. Talmud Ned 51a and 'Er 2b). See also the self-irony of the rabbis evident in their discussion on sweating (Shab 40a). This humour surfaces in conjecture on the later careers of Hananiah and his companions (probably drowned in spittle!), and in the reasons suggested for Daniel's absence from ch 3 (San 93a).

<sup>36</sup>For examples of the varying views of recent commentators, see Fewell, 145. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 121 and 125, senses a nuance of the mob and recognizes the appropriateness of 'thronging' as a translation.

A related example of this phenomenon is the genre known as the idol parody. Idol parodies are found particularly in Is 40 and 44, Jer 10, Hab 2, and Ps 115 and 135.<sup>37</sup> They work by building up a detailed picture of the physical limitations of idols and so emphasizing the incongruity of those who make them actually worshipping the works of their own hands. Although the apparent subject is the idols themselves, the target of the parody is those who worship them. This genre is later actualized in the stories of Bel and the Dragon.<sup>38</sup> Despite the differences between the idol parodies and Daniel 6, the mockery of sycophantic behaviour and the encounter of false powers with the true God in both suggests that parody was a thought form available to those who produced the Masoretic Text of Daniel.<sup>39</sup>

### dramatic irony

There is also dramatic irony at work through the ignorance by the characters of certain facts that are plain to the reader.<sup>40</sup> This is most clearly at the expense of Darius. He hears the fawning words of his officials but has no idea of the motivation behind them. The conspiratorial officials, who do not foresee the fast approaching pit floor, also display a level of ignorance. We have seen that the reader of MT is even uncertain as to how aware Daniel is of the events unfolding around him. His faithfulness may as well represent the habit of a life time (v 11, *וְיִהְיֶה עֲבָד מִן־קִדְמָת דָּנָה*) as an awareness of being caught in a conflict.

This irony is explicated by MT through the play on the word *דָּת*. The officials early recognized that the way to catch Daniel was 'by the law of his God' (v 6, *בְּדָת אֱלֹהֵהוּ*). The irony is that they then turn to a

---

<sup>37</sup>See Roth's treatment of Old Testament idol parodies.

<sup>38</sup>Roth, 21.

<sup>39</sup>See Roth, 43, on the link between idol parody and encounter story.

<sup>40</sup>For Caird, 134, that ignorance is a defining feature of dramatic irony. See further the discussion of Fewell, 147, on the irony of ignorance.

lesser law, 'the law of the Medes and the Persians' (vv 9, 13 and 16, **דת-מדי ופרס**) to achieve their ends, and fail because of their ignorance of the greater law. In the period in question **דת** had two distinct yet overlapping senses. It was probably a Persian loan word used for the law of the state. When applied to laws of the Jewish religion its meaning by extension came to include simply 'religion'. The sense of religion or custom was prevailing in JPA, but there was still considerable fluidity in late Biblical Hebrew.<sup>41</sup> Esther 3.8 sets the laws of the state (**דת**) against the law or custom of the Jews (**דת**) in explicit contrast.<sup>42</sup> This ambiguity between law and religion is exploited by the MT narrator. The two laws are considered in further detail in the context of the person of Darius below.

Another way of looking at the matter is to suggest that the effect being sought by MT is in fact something akin to a modern day situation comedy, with its cast of easily recognizable caricatures, a clear progression of the plot through small segments of action, and carefully timed entries and exits to comic effect. Misunderstandings arise because each member of the cast relates to some of the characters but never to them all. The characters remain ignorant whereas the reader or viewer is able to build a wider picture and sense possibilities still hidden from the actors. There is a level of suspense maintained because the narrator does not confirm those possibilities for the reader except through the action. Daniel 6 MT can be understood in those terms. We have already noted in some detail the progress of the action through a series of short distinct scenes. After the brief introduction each scene contains two of the three main character groups: Daniel, Darius and the conspirators. Even the penultimate scene is between Darius and Daniel only (vv 20-24), in contrast to 5. Only in the final episode (v 25) are the three brought together, but then Daniel's presence is only by implication. We have also seen that the narrator allows the action to speak for itself. This produces a level of suspense particularly when Daniel spends the night

---

<sup>41</sup>See Slotki, 48. Anderson, 67, understands **דת** only in terms of 'religion'.

<sup>42</sup>See Clines, 16f.



with the lions.

As with parody, this kind of dramatic irony is not unique to Daniel. An oft-treated incident is that involving David's affair with Bathsheba and his subsequent attempts to cover his tracks in 2 Sam 11.<sup>43</sup> That story also depends for its effect on reader uncertainty about the motivation of different characters as well as on the limited viewpoint of each of the actors. There is no explicit input from the narrator apart from the ominous conclusion that 'the thing that David had done was displeasing in the eyes of the Lord' (2 Sam 11.27, ירע הדבר אשר-עשה דוד בעיני יהוה). Irony, although not necessarily dramatic irony, has also been noted in the oracles of the nations of Amos 1f and the metaphorical language of Hosea 6.3f.<sup>44</sup>

The Masoretic Text contains a couple of neat examples of *double entendre* in its description of the conspirators' fate which reinforce the ironic tone of MT. The first is in the description of the plotters with the idiom for slander that translated literally speaks of those 'who had eaten pieces' (v 25, די-אכלו קדצווי) of Daniel. The second is the use of שלט to describe the lion's overpowering of the conspirators. This is a word for sovereignty throughout the Aramaic of Daniel and encapsulates the debate over where sovereignty lies.<sup>45</sup> The link here is with Darius' final decree which uses the corresponding verbal noun to describe both the kingdom of Darius and that of God (v 27). In a somewhat macabre way the proponents of the law of the Medes and Persians discover that law not only turned against them, but now, in the form of the lions, an expression of the law of Daniel's God. The double referent is not present in 5 as the kingdom of God in v 27 is only in MT plus material. Moreover in v 25 the Septuagint conveys a literal interpretation of the

---

<sup>43</sup>See the treatments in Sternberg, *Poetics*, 193ff, Bar-Efrat, 126f, and Good, *Irony*, 35f.

<sup>44</sup>Good, *Irony*, 34ff and 41n. While Good also sees the book of Jonah as ironic he admits that he has not found any commentators to support his opinion.

<sup>45</sup>Fewell, 152



idioms. The lions do not 'rule over' (שָׁלַט) but simply 'kill' (ἀπέκτειναν). In contrast Theodotion captures the imagery of MT with ἐκυρίευσαν. In ᠙ the men are not those who had 'eaten pieces' of Daniel but those who 'had born witness against' (καταμαρτυρήσαντες) him. Thus the irony is not present to the same degree as in MT.

### the building blocks of irony

The building blocks used to create this tone of subversion through irony are absent in ᠙.<sup>46</sup> The story is less episodic and the distinctions between scenes blurred, while the more overt narrator anticipates events and motives for the reader. The play on the words דָּן and דָּנָה is not present. We have already seen the Septuagint's difficulty with the latter term. The motif of דָּן does not occur because the issue of the law of God is not raised. The ᠙ equivalent to MT v 6 is an expansionary explanation of the upcoming plot. The interest is not so much in the 'law of his God' (v 6, דָּן אֱלֹהֵי) as in its outworking, Daniel 'prayed and pleaded with the Lord his God three times a day' (v 6, προσεύχεται καὶ δεῖται κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας). The sole occurrence of 'the law of the Medes and Persians' (v 13a) cannot be offset against the law of God. The hyperbole of MT is not present in the Septuagint which, if it is not certain how many plotters there are, only has two of them and their families thrown to the lions. The result is less a story that depends for its effect on subversive humour as a straightforward moral tale where the narrator's designs are explicit.

### perspectives on prayer

An examination of the vocabulary for prayer in each version throws further light on the differences in the nature of the narratives as well as moving the discussion toward the theological concerns of the stories. It is noticeable that both versions use two types of word to describe prayer. One type is confessional while the other is more ambiguous and

---

<sup>46</sup>Good, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy', 55, sees the Darius story as one of subversion from the inside.

less necessarily descriptive of religious activity.<sup>47</sup> The Masoretic Text uses the term **נָעַם** in vv 8, 13, and 14 with the object **נָעַם** on two of those occasions.<sup>48</sup> It also occurs in verse 12 but this time in tandem with **נָעַם** in the hithpaal form. The other mention of prayer is in v 11 and there the two words used are the participial forms of **נָעַם** and **נָעַם**.

A look at the context of the words suggests that this MT variation in vocabulary comes about by deliberate choice. On each occasion that **נָעַם** is used on its own (vv 8, 13 and 14) the speakers are the plotting officials. Vv 8 and 13 speak of the activities forbidden by the king's decree while the third usage is a description to the king of what the officials saw Daniel doing. The position of the speakers with respect to the activity being described, prayer or petition, is of outsiders looking in. In Biblical Aramaic **נָעַם** has the sense of petitioning the king (Dan 2.16 and 49) or God (Dan 2.23) or a heavenly being (Dan 7.16). The rare Biblical Hebrew equivalent **נָעַם** in its meaning of 'to seek, inquire' (Is 21.12) has a prophet as its object. In JPA the verbal noun means 'prayer' whereas the verb usually has a human object. The Theodotionic translator reflects this with his consistent choice of αἰτέω, a word that the Septuagint most often uses to represent the Hebrew **נָעַם**. This simply means 'to ask' with no special connection with a prayer context. Hence the MT narrator has chosen vocabulary that is ambiguous. In the first place it does not specify that the king has to be divine to be the object of such petitions, but there is a hint that he could be. At the same time the satraps and leaders choose a word when they speak which falls short of being a witness to the fact that Daniel is in contact with his God, but the suggestion is clear.

This becomes more obvious in v 11, a point in the story when the scene shifts and the perspective changes. No longer is the reader seeing things through the eyes of Darius and his pagan advisers but is

---

<sup>47</sup>Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 345, explicates this interplay between public and confessional terminology in chs 3 and 6.

<sup>48</sup>The variation in spelling between **נָעַם** and **נָעַם** is part of the wider Aramaic phenomenon of vacillation in spelling for roots originally ending in **נָ** and **נָ**. See Rosenthal, 51. I use **נָעַם** to refer to either variant.

witnessing a scene directly mediated by the narrator, who tells us that Daniel goes into his upper chamber to pray. At this point the pair of verbs **צָלַא** and **דָּא** in their participial forms (**מַצְלָא וּמְדָא**) are employed. In contrast to **בָּעָא** both verbs are confessional, particularly the latter. Its other occurrence in the book of Daniel is in Daniel's hymn of praise in chapter 2 (2.20-23). Its Hebrew equivalent **יָדָה** is used in the hiphil more than 50 times in the Psalms, emphasizing that it had become a word of ritual worship. It is almost always translated by the Septuagint as *ἐξομολογέω* as indeed it is by *θ* at this point and by both Greek versions in ch 2. It is also a *Leitwort* in the Hymn of the Three Young Men in ch 3. The verb **צָלַא** is not quite as well attested. Its only other Biblical Aramaic occurrence is in Ezra 6.10 where it also has the sense of prayer to God. There, as with Theodotion here, it is translated *προσεύχομαι*. There is no Hebrew equivalent but its Pael form means 'to pray' in Jerusalem Palestinian Aramaic, and the JPA verbal noun **צָלוּ** means 'prayer'.

It would appear that the narrator wants the reader to be clear on the religious nature of Daniel's activity, whereas the plotters in their speeches link it to the idea of petitioning a human king and leave it undefined as to whether this implies divinity in the sovereign. There is another scene which uses prayer vocabulary when the narrator describes the officials' spying on Daniel at prayer. Here the pairing **בָּעָא וּמַחְתֵּן** (v 12) brings together the two perspectives already noted. We have already seen the sense of **בָּעָא** but **חָתֵן** is not quite so flexible in referent. This hithpaal participle is the only Biblical Aramaic occurrence of that root, but its Hebrew equivalent in the hithpaal theme has as its object God more often than man. Indeed, the hithpaal with the sense of seeking favour from God is always translated by *ט* as *δέομαι*. The two verbs in tandem like this reflect the dual perspective in this central verse in the prayer theme. Daniel 'seeking favour before his God' (v 12, **מַחְתֵּן קִדְמָא אֱלֹהֵהּ**) is an echo of the narrator's description of the previous verse, particularly with the repetition of **קִדְמָא אֱלֹהֵהּ**. At the same time the use of **בָּעָא** reflects the way his enemies view him.

The Septuagint also has this divergence in vocabulary, although variations in the shape of the story make it difficult to chart direct

correspondence with MT. The difference is encapsulated in v 6 which contains two pairs of verbs relating to prayer or petition. In the first part of the verse the words of the royal decree are formulated by the discontented leaders. There they employ the pair of verbs ἀξιόω and εὐχομαι probably as an expression equivalent to the Aramaic **בִּעַל בְּעוּ** (MT vv 8 and 14). Each member of the pair reflects the Semitic construction of a verb taking its cognate noun as object. The second part of v 6, a Θ plus, is a narratorial description of the plotters' motivation, and a completely different pair of words is used to give the narrator's, rather than the plotters', view of Daniel's activity: προσεύχεται καὶ δεῖται. The first pair, with the same Semitic construction, is also to be found in vv 8 and 13 although in reverse order.

While ἀξιόω can be used of a petition addressed to God, its object is often human. The Septuagint most often uses it to reflect the Hebrew **נָטַח** or even **נָשָׂא**. The latter word is ubiquitous while the former has the primary meaning of 'to leave or abandon'. One of its senses in the niphal can be that of permission being granted, but even then a context of dealings with the divine is not required. In Θ Daniel the object of ἀξιόω can be the king, as it is in v 9 (see also for example 2.16 and 49). As far as εὐχομαι is concerned the situation is not so clear. The Septuagint uses the word in almost equal proportions to translate **נָצַח** or **נָדַר**, 'to make a vow', and **פָּלַל** or **עָהָר**, 'to pray'. The 'vow' meaning often takes εὐχὴν as its object, or at least understands it. The vow is most often made to God. This type of understanding is well illustrated in 1 Esdras 4.43ff. It is not possible to draw any firm conclusions about the combination of verbs as this particular pairing only occurs in Septuagintal Greek in this chapter. The combination seems to be intended to represent **בִּעַל**, perhaps even as a type of hendiadys. The two words together result in the same sort of ambiguity as is contained in the Aramaic **בִּעַל**. This is in contrast to Theodotion's use of αἰτέω (vv 8 and 13) already alluded to which reduces the ambiguity by using a word with a strongly human referent. In that respect Θ can be said to be interpretative at this point.

The second pair in v 6, which is part of a narratorial description of Daniel's religious activities is προσεύχεται καὶ δεῖται. The first

term hardly needs exposition as it inevitably means prayer to God. It is most common in Daniel in ch 9 where both Greek versions use it or its related noun to render פלל or the related noun תפלה. In Ezra 6.10 it translates the Aramaic צלא, which is probably the verb reflected in this context. θ demonstrates this understanding with his translation of צלא as προσευχόμενος in v 11. The verb δέομαι is usually but not inevitably a translation of תנן. It usually has the divine as its object. That is certainly the sense in which θ understands it in v 12. The Septuagint of Daniel brings the two terms together in 9.20 with the phrase δεόμενος ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς. That suggests that in this pairing with προσεύχομαι, δέομαι has the nuance of bringing petitions to God rather than to a human figure.<sup>49</sup> The same pair occurs in v 9. These verbs together probably correspond to MT מצלא ומודא in v 11.

As far as the argument so far is concerned, the words of the decree in Θ reflect the same sort of ambivalence as do those of MT, and the narrator shows the same certainty about the nature of Daniel's prayer activity when that is described. However, to complete the picture, the words for prayer in vv 12 and 14 do not reflect so clearly the pattern discernible in MT. In v 12 where the plotters catch Daniel praying, the participle εὐχόμενον is used on its own. In this instance Θ is in direct parallel with MT, and one word is used to represent two in Aramaic, בעא ומחתנן. We have seen that εὐχομαι can vary in meaning but usually has God as object either of a petition or a vow. In the context of this passage the sense is almost certainly prayer to God although, unlike MT and θ, the object is not stated. In v 14 a different pairing again is used, εὐχόμενον καὶ δεόμενον. This is in sharp contrast to the Masoretic Text which has the more neutral בעא translated as αἰτέω by Theodotion.

The upshot is that the Septuagint recognizes the same kind of distinctions in the words for prayer or petition as the Masoretic Text.

---

<sup>49</sup>Such is the usage detected by Seeligmann, 101, in Isaiah who says προσευχή and δέησις are 'used more or less promiscuously'. The translator of Θ Daniel at this point reflects a Septuagintal tradition. However compare Lacocque, *Daniel*, 91, who points out that Antiochus used δέομαι of intercessions to himself.

However, apart from the consistency with which the words of the actual decree are reported, the vocabulary of prayer is not used to the same extent to distinguish the viewpoint of the narrator from that of the characters in the story. On the occasions when the praying of Daniel is reported, the actions and viewpoint of the conspirators is in evidence, yet the verbs chosen all represent to some degree the confessional stance of the narrator. This stance is reinforced by the grammatical indicators chosen to indicate the direction of prayer. In the decree, the words for prayer always take ἀπὸ or παρὰ (vv 6, 8 and 13) whereas when Daniel's prayer activity is described its object is either denoted by the genitive (v 6) or by the idiom τοῦ προσώπου (v 14). Twice there is no object. These more confessional forms of expression clarify the narrator's own views on the nature of Daniel's praying. This is all part of the phenomenon noted earlier of a more visible narrator and is epitomized in the Θ plus of v 6 as well as its repeated form in v 9. There the narrator ascribes motives to the leaders while overriding their perspective with his own point of view.

### the divinity of the king

At the same time the evidence from this prayer vocabulary hints at a different theological perspective between the versions. The Masoretic Text has chosen words with carefully nuanced meaning which, as well as portraying perspective, suggest a certain subtlety to the issues at stake. Appropriately for its Persian setting, the question of the divinity of the king is not paramount in MT, although it is undeniable that such a possibility tantalizes the reader of the Masoretic Text.<sup>50</sup> The ambiguity of the story on this point could just as well make it a more general commentary on the tendency for authority figures of every

---

<sup>50</sup>The contention of Stuart, 171, that 'Parsism taught its votaries to reverence the king as the symbol or personification of Ormusd...' must be treated with caution as most of his sources are later Greeks. Walton, 283ff, wonders if the decree was intended to install the king as sole mediator of his subjects' prayers. He speculates that the decree may reflect a wider struggle within Zoroastrianism between an orthodox monotheism and the more eclectic practices of the Magi. See the survey of Gershevitch, 14ff.



age to take upon themselves as much importance as people are willing to ascribe to them.<sup>51</sup> That tendency partly feeds the satire of this story, which is less an issue of divinity and more a question of where Daniel's loyalties lie.<sup>52</sup> In other terms, whose **דָּת** ('law') has the first claim? This is reflected in the wording of the king's decree which does not outlaw prayer to 'any god' but to 'any god or man' (v 8 and 13, **כל-אלה ואנש**).<sup>53</sup> The **ואנש** following as it does the verb **בעא** reinforces the point that it does not matter whether Darius is human or divine but it does matter who is being petitioned, whose law is being obeyed. The issue of whether or not the king was divine is certainly present but it functions as a backdrop to the story.

The matter is more clear cut in **Ἡ**. Prayer is prohibited to 'any god' (vv 6 and 13, ἀπὸ / παρὰ παντὸς θεοῦ). There is no modifying **ואנש** in any of the accounts of the content of the decree (vv 6, 8 and 13) which immediately suggests that something else is at stake. The focus is on the status of the one petitioned rather than the motivation of the petitioner. The issue of whether or not the king is divine moves into the foreground. V 14 is a moment of decision in both stories and the process is in evidence there. MT uses the same word as the edict uses to depict Daniel's action, **בעא**. Thereby the matter at stake is the sage's obedience or otherwise to the decree. The Masoretic Text does not even specify at this point the object of Daniel's petitions. In contrast to this the Septuagint by its choice of the pair εὐχόμενον καὶ δεόμενον portrays the issue as one related to divinity. **Ἡ** even specifies that Daniel is praying and petitioning 'the face of his God' (τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ

---

<sup>51</sup>For variations on this view see Fewell, 147, Goldingay, 'The Stories in Daniel', 100, and Slotki, 48. Contrast this with Hammer, 69, and Montgomery, *Daniel*, 270, who sees an anachronistic reference to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. Josephus avoids the issue of kingly divinity by saying the decree forbade petitions 'either to him (the king) or to gods' (*Antiquities*, X.253, μήτ' αὐτῷ τις μήτε τοῖς θεοῖς).

<sup>52</sup>Boogaart, 109, detects a *Sitz im Leben* of a king demanding loyalty from his vassals.

<sup>53</sup>Contrast Montgomery, *Daniel*, 270, who sees no further significance in this phrase than as an example of hyperbole such as that found in Jon 3.8.



θεοῦ αὐτοῦ), although too much should not be made of that particular difference with MT as there is no clear pattern in the way ̳ uses that or similar expressions in the present chapter. This relates to the paucity of reference to the law of the Medes and the Persians in ̳, a point which is discussed more fully elsewhere.

As a footnote to this section, it must be acknowledged that the Septuagint, like MT, employs an ambiguous word order to describe the decree: '...from any god for thirty days except from you, O King' (v 13, παρὰ παντὸς θεοῦ ἕως ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα ἀλλὰ παρὰ σοῦ βασιλεῦ). It could be argued that the intervention of ἕως ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα between 'any god' and 'except from you' leaves it unclear whether the king is to be thought of primarily as a god or as one being petitioned. The equivalent phrase in v 6 employs the third rather than the second person but has the same word order. However, the consistency with which the words of the king's edict in ̳ equates with those in MT suggests the word order here simply reflects the Old Greek's *Vorlage*, and that the real points of significance are to be found where the two versions differ, as they do over the object of the prayers and petitions.

### **Darius and his encyclical**

The goal of both versions, if not the denouement of the story, is Darius' encyclical at the end of the chapter. If it is true that the theological issues can be differentiated in the way just outlined, then we could expect this to show through in the treatment by each version of the figure of King Darius at the end of the chapter. The focus of his letter is similar on most points. Everybody is required to worship the God of Daniel. This God's general attributes are set out for the benefit of the populace and his particular activity in rescuing Daniel is mentioned.

A crucial difference is in the stance adopted by Darius himself towards these events. The Septuagint Darius makes a personal commitment to the God of Daniel at v 28 (ἐγὼ Δαρεῖος ἔσομαι αὐτῷ προσκυνῶν...). Because the usurpation of divine functions by the human is more central for the Septuagint, the response from a chastened Darius must be an

ascription of divinity in the right quarter. Darius provides such a response with his promise to 'serve' God all his days. The distinction between the two participles λατρεύοντες (v 27) and δουλεύων (v 28) both meaning 'serving' is not immediately clear. Darius calls his people to do the former and promises to do the latter himself. Λατρεύω is a word almost exclusively used in the context of service of God or gods, while δουλεύω, also used to translate עבד, has a wider range of meaning. MT and Θ are not able to help distinguish the meanings here as their content is different from the Septuagint.

It could be a matter of style that the Θ translator has opted for variety and chosen a pair of synonyms, but the tenor of the rest of this confession makes it likely that a particular section of the semantic field of δουλεύω is intended and that it has not been used randomly. That assumption, if it is correct, puts us in touch with a tradition that uses δουλεύω when the context is God's delegation of authority to a gentile king so that he might be 'served' by the people of Israel. The Hebrew uses עבד in both contexts, but the Septuagint seems to distinguish between issues of divine allegiance for the people and issues of authority for kings.<sup>54</sup> The distinction is neatly illustrated by Judges 3.7f where the people 'served' (עבדו) translated by ἐλάτρευσαν) Baal, and God punished them by giving them over to King Cushan-risathaim whom they 'served' (עבדו) translated as ἐδούλευσαν). Earlier in the chapter (vv 17 and 21) Darius speaks of the God whom Daniel serves and the word used is λατρεύω. Both times it translates פלח, which describes in 3.17 and 28/95 the service of the three young men to their God. Here too the translation is λατρεύω by both Θ and θ in 3.28/95, although the Septuagint prefers φοβέομαι in 3.17.

A further dimension to the distinction may be that λατρεύω is a word particularly associated with cultic matters. When it occurs in conjunction with προσκυνέω, as it does in v 27 and ch 3 and frequently in the Pentateuch (for example Ex 20.5 and 23.24; Dt 4.19, 5.9, 8.19, 11.16,

---

<sup>54</sup> Another word used in Greek to render עבד is ἐργάζομαι, which is probably closest to the full semantic range of עבד. See for example Jer 22.13; 27/34.6; 30/37.8f; 34/41.14 and 18.

17.3 and 30.17), the context is cultic worship. This is supremely illustrated in Ex 20.5 where veneration of images is prohibited. In Daniel 6 and 3 the word is used to describe the heroes' ritual activity. Even when Nebuchadnezzar promises to 'serve' (4.37a, λατρεύω), it could be argued that the context is cultic as later in the same verse he speaks of making sacrifices. On the other hand δουλεύω rarely occurs with προσκυνέω in Septuagintal Greek (Gen 27.29; 3 Ki 9.6; Ps 71.11; Jer 13.10 and 25.6), and when it does the context has more to do with allegiance of the heart than direction of cultic ritual.

Nebuchadnezzar was also one whom God had appointed to be served (Jer 34.6, ἔδωκα τὴν γῆν...δουλεύειν αὐτῷ) by his people as well as by the earth.<sup>55</sup> This tradition lurks in the shadows of the tree in Ἔ ch 4. Part of Daniel's allegorical interpretation of the great tree was that the creatures sheltered by it represented the nations serving Nebuchadnezzar (4.21, αἱ χῶραι σοὶ δουλεύουσιν). Later on the message of the angel to the king is that he should serve the God of heaven (4.34, δούλευσον τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The one being served had to become the servant. If Darius is being thought of in the light of such a tradition, this helps to explain the choice of δουλεύω and suggests at the very least that Ἔ puts Darius in good company.

The Septuagint may also reflect the tradition found in 1 Esdras 4 about Zerubbabel and Darius. In this tradition Zerubbabel is the successor to Daniel at the Persian court and helps Darius to play a significant role in facilitating the return of Jews to Jerusalem. A link in administrative terminology is seen at 1 Esd 4.47 when the king writes a letter to 'treasurers and governors and prefects and satraps' (οἰκονόμους καὶ τοπάρχας καὶ στρατηγοὺς καὶ σατράπας). The list is very close to that of MT v 8 ('prefects and satraps, courtiers and governors') which Theodotion translates στρατηγοὶ καὶ σατράπαι, ὑπατοὶ καὶ τοπάρχαι.

---

<sup>55</sup>Humphreys, 212, notes the importance of the Jeremiah tradition of Nebuchadnezzar in the diaspora world. This phrase is a textual crux as Ἔ does not represent exactly the MT עֲבָדֵי. For a full discussion see Tov, 'Exegetical Notes', 84, Lemke, 48, and McKane, 100.

The interest of Θ in the person of Darius in vv 26ff is in contrast to the Masoretic Text. This is further illustrated at v 29. MT switches the focus immediately back to Daniel and displays no further personal interest in the king, whereas the Septuagint in a highly suggestive phrase tells us that King Darius 'was gathered to his people' (v 29, προσετέθη πρὸς τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ). Any Jewish reader of these words must have been aware of the history of the phrase in Θ. Used in the sense here the verb always translates **יָסַד**, and either γένος or λαός is used to represent **עַם**, or πατήρ to represent the Hebrew variation in the formula. It is always used of one of the chosen people generally approved of by the biblical account. In the historical books the patriarchs (along with Ishmael), Moses and Josiah are all gathered to their people (for example Gen 25.8, 35.29 and 49.29; Dt 32.50). In later tradition Judith's husband Manasses, Mattathias and Jonathan the high priest are gathered to their people (Ju 16.22, 1 Mac 2.69 and 14.30). A portmanteau phrase probably intended to reflect approval is used of Achior the Ammonite who is 'gathered into the house of Israel' (Ju 14.10, προσετέθη εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ). This is the closest a gentile comes to such a reward in the Septuagint tradition. Significantly a whole generation are gathered to their fathers in Judges 2.10 because they 'served the Lord' (Jud 2.7, ἐδούλευσεν...τῷ κυρίῳ). Darius too promised that he would be serving (v 28, δουλεύων). It is not certain and not crucial to the point being made whether the Θ narrator envisaged Darius as an honorary Israelite or simply intended to convey a sense of high regard for the king. Either way a note of approval is struck and the epitaph suggests a comprehensive conversion to the God of Israel on the part of the monarch.

This approval is foreshadowed in the first verse of the Septuagint version of the story, as opposed to MT, where another ancient formula is used to describe the gentile king. The phrase 'full of days' (v 1, πλήρης τῶν ἡμερῶν) elsewhere in the Greek Old Testament always represents the Hebrew **שָׁנָה יָמִים**. It describes Abraham, Isaac, David, Solomon, Jehoiada and Job and nobody else. In Genesis (25.8 and 35.29) it is used in conjunction with 'gathered to his people', and twice (Gen 25.8 and 1 Chr 29.28) the phrase ἐν γῆραι is also nearby. By bracketing the story

of Daniel in the lion's den with such evocative descriptions of Darius, the narrator places his conversion to the God of Israel as a central theme in the story.

In contrast to 5, the Masoretic Text does not develop Darius as fully as it succeeds in doing with Belshazzar. He begins and ends the story in close relationship to Daniel and changes little during the course of the narrative. His ordinance at the end is an important development for the theme of the two laws but he himself is little touched by events.<sup>56</sup> This highlights another difference between the versions at vv 27f. MT uses kingdom and law language that is not present in 5. The phrase 'I have set up an ordinance...' (v 27, מִן-קִדְמוֹ שֵׁם טַעַם) recalls the decree that Darius set up earlier, although the vocabulary is not identical. At the same time, the idiom שֵׁם...טַעַם echoes the central moment in v 14 where the crime of Daniel was that he 'did not pay regard to' (לֹא-שָׁם...טַעַם) the king. The MT also speaks of 'his (God's) kingdom' (v 27, מַלְכוּתָהּ) in contrast to 'my (Darius') kingdom' (v 27, מַלְכוּתִי).<sup>57</sup>

In fact the distinction between the versions occurs much earlier when the plotters begin their work. In the 5 plus material of v 6, where their motivation is revealed, the trap is to be found in the fact that Daniel prays to 'his God' three times a day. In MT the satraps and leaders are explicit that their complaint against Daniel must be found 'in the law of his God' (בְּדִין אֱלֹהֵי). The terms are set right at the beginning. The effect of all this is to see Darius' declaration in terms of the theme of the two laws (דִּין), God's law or the law of the Medes and the Persians. The final encyclical is less personal and more of an expression of submission by one kingdom to another.<sup>58</sup> There is a corresponding loss of interest in the person of the king.

---

<sup>56</sup>Slotki, 55, considers that 'The narrative of the chapter is intended to teach a lesson not to the king, but to his heathen subjects'.

<sup>57</sup>For Levinger, 394, this aspect of MT makes the story of Daniel 6 'a model of a fighting national literature'.

<sup>58</sup>Young, *Daniel*, 139, puts it another way when he detects that 'Darius does not rise above his polytheistic background'. Compare Towner, *Daniel*, 90, who speaks of the king's 'confession' in MT.

### the king and Daniel

The matter of the character of the king can be taken a little further. There is a strange difference between the versions over the description of Daniel in v 14, which we note is central to the struggle for loyalty. As in previous chapters in the book of Daniel, a reminder is given by MT of the origins of Daniel as a Jewish exile (v 14, ...מִן בְּנֵי גְלוּתָא). Those are the terms in which his enemies describe him here. This highlights the struggle between the law represented by the Judean and the Law of the Medes and the Persians. Strangely the Septuagint narrative simply describes Daniel in the words of the conspirators as 'your friend' (v 14, τὸν φίλον σου). With this terminology the aspect of a contest between rival מלך is not present and the issue is a much more personal one.

The phrase φίλον σου functions at more than one level. It describes an existing relationship with Daniel thus reinforcing the positive view of Darius foreshadowed in the first verse and brought to fruition at the end. It also introduces a tone of irony into the narrative which reflects on both the motivation of the plotters and the quandary of Darius. As far as the two leaders are concerned the issue is a personal one and their choice of words reflects badly on them. In the process a gap is allowed into the 5 narrative, unusually for a narrator who normally leaves little to the imagination of the reader. After Darius has foolishly reiterated his commitment to do what his officials tell him (v 13) the plotters simply state what they have found in Daniel. Their description of Daniel to the king as 'your friend' is an effective although unintended portrayal of their own feelings at this point.

### the character of Daniel

A marked feature of the narrative, especially in the Masoretic Text, is the silence maintained by Daniel right up to the climactic conversation and events on the morning of his release. In forming a picture of Daniel the reader is entirely dependent on the information of the narrator, who focuses on his competence and honesty and his adherence



to the law (ἔν) of his God. The first time he speaks, the suspense of Darius' sleepless night is broken as Daniel witnesses to the angel's work on his behalf and declares his innocence (v 23). Yet despite his silence Daniel functions as the focal point for the question of the two laws against which others are judged.

The character of Daniel is treated in a similar manner by the Septuagint although as we have seen he functions more as the embodiment of the question facing Darius of service or disobedience to God. Perhaps because of that particular role the silence of Daniel is not so complete. He breaks into speech at the same point in the story, but when he does he carries on to point an accusing finger at Darius and those who led him astray. As well as illustrating his role as judge, another effect of this extra speech containing the singular 'you cast' (v 23, ἔρριψας) is to implicate Darius in the crime against Daniel and his God. This makes the whole issue more personal and prepares the way for the king's subsequent confession.

### idols

A further clue to the interests of the Septuagint version is found in the problematic reference to 'idols made by hands' (v 28, εἰδωλα τὰ χειροποίητα). There does not seem to be any need to refer to idols as they have not been an issue in this story. The connective γὰρ does not follow from what immediately precedes it nor from the content of the story as a whole. The phrase has no equivalent in MT, but what follows, 'like the God of Daniel has redeemed Daniel' (ὥς ἐλυτρώσατο...) probably equates to MT. The note about idols seems like an interpolation on the part of the translator. While the logical links may not be obvious, the connective ὥς provides a clue that in the mind of the translator the comparison is encapsulated in the words 'cannot save' (οὐ δύνανται σῶσαι) and 'like (God)...has redeemed' (ὥς ἐλυτρώσατο). The contrast is heightened by the word order which juxtaposes them. The translator betrays his continuing interest in the issue of idolatry with this



insertion.<sup>59</sup> This is a more explicit manifestation of the concern for cultic purity discernible behind the 5 choice of vocabulary discussed above.<sup>60</sup>

### the trial of Daniel

Other differences in the two stories come to light in a comparison of the trial undergone by Daniel. In this connection the Septuagint clarifies some matters that remain unclear in MT. In the Aramaic telling of events the behaviour of the king after the committal of Daniel to the lions' pit, and Daniel's first words to him in the morning are puzzling. Why was he so desperate to see the dawn? MT hints at its importance with a double reference to first thing in the morning (v 20, **בשפרפרא** and **בנגהא**). What thoughts lay behind the king's first words uttered on arrival at the pit? To the modern reader it seems strange to carry on a conversation with a man in a lions' pit when we would have expected rescue to be the first priority. The king's subsequent actions make it clear that for some reason he is entitled to rescue Daniel at this point despite the law of the Medes and the Persians. Daniel's reply is also strange, particularly his concern to claim innocence before the king (v 23, **זכו...ואף קדמך...לא עבדה**). He seems to draw a deliberate link not only between his rescue from the lions and his innocence before God but also between his rescue and the fact that he has done no 'harm' (v 23, **חבולה**) to the king. This latter aspect is left hanging by MT, the significance of which we come to later. The thought occurs that some type of trial by ordeal of specific duration is taking place.<sup>61</sup>

There is little in the way of contemporary source material against

---

<sup>59</sup>Seeligmann, 100, notes a similar polemic against idol worship in 5 Isaiah. The references in Is 1.29, 27.9, 37.19, 41.28 and 57.5 are all interpretations rather than literal translations of MT.

<sup>60</sup>See the discussion on 'idol parodies' in Wills, 132.

<sup>61</sup>Cassin, 142, refers to an 'ordalie' as part of her thesis on Daniel 6, but does not develop the idea. See also the allusion of Schmidt, 2, to 'The ordeal has been successful...'. Boogaart, 110, also sees a test of God's sovereignty 'according to the condition of the trial by ordeal'.

which to check this notion, and certainly nothing that links a night in the lion pit to a legal procedure. There is plenty of evidence for a river ordeal in earlier Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions and something as late as 1200 BCE which alludes to an ordeal, but not much from the period in question here.<sup>62</sup> There is however one set of late Babylonian inscriptions published and translated by Lambert and which he takes to be from Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>63</sup> Although there is nothing about lions, on one column there is talk of a river ordeal in terms strongly reminiscent of this chapter.<sup>64</sup> There is the same interest in time as it is a 'judgement by night'; there is the same collection of important figures in the early morning seen in the words, 'When dawn shone prince, regent and troops, gathering as the king had commanded...'; and there is the same concern for proof of innocence as the gathered dignitaries are there 'to behold justice...'. There is some ambiguity in that despite the phrase 'judgement by night' the actual ordeal seems to take place in the morning. It must also be granted that a river ordeal is quite another thing from a lion pit. Nevertheless similar procedures and expectations seem to surround them and suggest that there is something of the ordeal, in the technical sense, behind our story.

That such is the case is made more likely by an examination of some details in the Septuagint account. Firstly there is the group who go with the king to seal the lion pit against any outside interference. They are the same group at the feast of Belshazzar, the μεγιστάνες (v 18, רַב־רִבִּין in MT). These 'nobles' do not appear at any other point in ch 6. The groups that Darius deals with elsewhere are either the satraps or Daniel's fellow leaders. In 5, as we have seen, it tends to be the two leaders while in MT the satraps and their leaders work together. In neither version is there any other reference to the group of officials in

---

<sup>62</sup>Driver and Miles, 87ff and 390ff, for example, note the use of the ordeal for sexual and other unproved matters. See also the discussion of Cardascia, 25ff, on the river ordeal in Assyrian law.

<sup>63</sup>Lambert, 2

<sup>64</sup>Lambert, 9. Wiseman, *Nebuchadnezzar*, 100, links Daniel's ordeal with the late Babylonian river ordeal.

v 18. Cassin believes this to be a defined group distinct from the others in the story. She sees them as members of the king's entourage who are called in as legal witnesses at this point to take part in 'un acte de formalisme juridique'.<sup>65</sup> Such a view fits in with the link to ch 5 that this group provides. The group at Belshazzar's feast would have been members of the central court as here, rather than those responsible for the administration of outlying areas appointed by Darius.

Both versions include the detail that the king strove 'until the setting of the sun' (v 15, *עד מעלי שמשא* and *ἕως δυσμῶν ἡλίου*) implying that that was the time when the trial should begin. The Septuagint adds two notes that are not in the Aramaic. The first is the parting shot from the king that Daniel should 'Have courage till morning' (v 17, *ἕως πρωὶ θάρρει*). This makes explicit that the trial has a time limit and is an absurd remark unless the king has some sort of expectation that Daniel could survive until morning.<sup>66</sup> It may just have been a hope of last resort that if he survived by some miracle he could be released, but the remark seems more definite than that. The second difference in the Septuagint is the detail that Darius after his sleepless night arose and 'received the satraps' (v 20, *παρέλαβε μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς σατράπας*) before they all went together to the lion pit (v 20). It seems that the satraps fulfill some sort of legal function, equivalent to that of the group who applied their signet rings to the stone the night before. Perhaps they are witnesses to the end of the trial or ordeal of Daniel. A problem with this latter detail is that it is not the same group who witnessed the sealing of the pit. If there is any weight to the argument that the witnesses are a different group of court officials, it is strange that the account reverts to the protagonists, the satraps, at this point. It could of course simply illustrate the uncertainty of the translator over Persian administrative terms, as I suggested above in another context.

---

<sup>65</sup>Cassin, 141

<sup>66</sup>See again Müller, 'Märchen, Legende', 345, who senses in MT also an interaction between a human event and divine intervention. He speaks of an event 'übernatürliche und zugleich handfest-dingliche'.

In general terms, the possibility that an identifiable legal procedure lies behind the story of Daniel in the lions' pit is a helpful one. It may well tell us something about the *Sitz im Leben* behind the tradition of Daniel in the lion pit without necessarily clarifying questions of the priority of versions. Ch 4 provides a parallel to this situation in that each version gives a different picture of the period spent in exile by Nebuchadnezzar, but the two accounts together suggest some sort of common source for the stories.

### literary merit in the Septuagint

A different form of narrative and different concerns from MT on the part of the Septuagint does not imply that this ᠙ chapter is without literary merit. The same sort of storytelling touches that were noticeable in ch 4 are here also.<sup>67</sup> Where problems in the narrative form do occur, the reasons are as likely to be compositional as literary. An example of the storyteller at work is the trace of irony about Darius' bold declaration that 'the word is accurate and the injunction remains' (v 13, Ἀκριβὴς ὁ λόγος καὶ μενεῖ ὁ ὀρισμός). The words and syntax strike a resonance with the declaration by the angel to Nebuchadnezzar that 'my word is accurate and your time is fulfilled' (4.27, ἀκριβὴς γάρ μου ὁ λόγος καὶ πλήρης ὁ χρόνος σου), and reflect badly on Darius' bravado at this moment. It also explicates the issue of sovereignty which we saw earlier is not entirely absent from ᠙ ch 6.

The penultimate sentence of the Septuagint account contains a piece of parallelism that provides a nice summary of the concerns of the story: 'And King Darius was gathered to his people, and Daniel was set up in the kingdom of Darius'. Apart from the coincidence of syntax, the effectiveness of the summary is heightened by the assonance of the two verbs προσετέθη and κατεστάθη balanced against each other.

---

<sup>67</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 280, acknowledges 'some lively touches, which are characteristic of ᠙'s genius...'.

### **narrative links with Daniel 4 and 5**

A number of links with chapters previously studied have been alluded to in the course of the present discussion. However there are still further links to be drawn out. This is undertaken with the proviso that the discussion is incomplete at this stage because, on most analyses, the story with the closest relationship to Daniel in the lion pit is the story of the three young men in ch 3. A discussion of the connections between chs 3 and 6 will take place after my treatment of ch 3.

Several of the differences in narrative technique in Daniel 6 have already been identified in Dan 4 and 5. The MT narrator seldom admits the reader into his omniscience but leaves him to discern the significance of the action or words of the characters. Manipulation of perspective is undertaken to good effect. We have seen all this in the story of Darius and Daniel in the lion pit as well. However the present chapter does not display the same concern for character development as do the previous two. This is a function of the difference between a conflict and a contest. In a court conflict the main character begins and ends in a position of prominence and relationships between characters remain static.

In contrast the Septuagint narrator in 4 and 5 as well as here guides the reader by sharing his omniscience rather than manipulation of perspective and repetition. A prominent result of that narratorial stance in ch 6 is the attribution of motive to the different characters. That same effect was observable where the monarchs were concerned in the previous chapters studied, but it is applied here on a wider scale, right down to the explanation of why the stone over the pit has to be sealed.

### **thematic links with Daniel 4 and 5**

A comparison of 6 with MT in chapter 6 reveals several themes that were also detected in earlier chapters. The issues are presented in terms of personal choices facing the monarch. Belshazzar is condemned for his personal sin rather than a public stance. Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the tree is understood as an allegory of that king's reign rather than

a parable on the sovereignty of kings. Darius' final acknowledgement of God is couched in terms of a personal confession rather than a choice between two kingdoms. The translator of 6 continues the polemic against idol worship that was a central theme in both versions of ch 5 despite the fact that the choice facing Darius had nothing to do with idols. This theme is the obverse side of the concern for cultic purity that may be detected in ch 4 where Nebuchadnezzar is condemned for his desecration of the Israelite cult. Just as Nebuchadnezzar responded in cultic terms by promising to make sacrifices, so Darius makes a more personal confession in 6 than he does in MT. Belshazzar never gets the chance to make any sort of confession. The result for both chs 4 and 6 is that the Septuagint emerges as less universalist in its attitude towards the monarchs and more concerned for the purity of the God of Israel. That theme is present strongly in both accounts of ch 5 so the difference between the versions is not manifest in that chapter.

Inherent in the different suggestions about Daniel's position at court are different links to the preceding chapters. The MT story, as a court conflict, opens with the hero already in a position of influence and moves on to develop a threat to that position from within the court. In verse 3 Daniel is one of three leaders already in power. The king 'set up' (v 2, **הקים**) the 120 satraps, but the leaders may already have been in existence. This is suggested by the wording 'and over them were three leaders' (v 3, **ועלם מנהלן שרכין חלחא**), of whom Daniel was one.<sup>68</sup> The conclusion to the story is that Daniel 'prospered' (v 29, **הצלח**) during the reigns of Darius and Cyrus. The haphel form in Aramaic does not require the sense of being promoted or caused to prosper, and the participle suggests continuity.<sup>69</sup> The picture of Daniel is that he continues in a position already attained in previously charted contests. Chapters 4 and 5 are at ease with the picture of a Daniel moving in the secular life of the court.

---

<sup>68</sup>Delcor, *Daniel*, 135, describes him as 'super-satrape', a neat solution to the problem of how exactly to translate **סרף**.

<sup>69</sup>See Rosenthal, 55, on the participle. He considers, 42, that the haphel is usually causative, but consultation of BDB and Jastrow suggests that is not a necessary or usual sense for the haphel of **צלח**.



The Septuagint does not contain those contests in chs 4 and 5. As we have seen ̡ ch 5 avoids the question of Daniel's courtly position while ch 4 plays down its significance. In ch 6 Daniel is clearly a figure at court. The story depends on him holding that position, but it is not assumed from the beginning. When Darius promotes his 127 satraps he also sets aside (v 3) three men of whom Daniel was one, and subsequently in a section of plus material decides 'to set up' (v 4, καταστήσαι) or promote the sage further. The summary in v 29 states that Daniel 'was set up' (v 29, κατεστάθη), the same word used of the 127 satraps in v 2.<sup>70</sup> This is a word more appropriate to the conclusion of a contest than the successful outcome of a conflict depicted by 𐤏𐤥𐤕 in MT. It is the same word used to describe God's promotion of Nebuchadnezzar's usurper (4.31). The resulting introduction of a contest is appropriate to a story which has not recognized the contests that MT assumes.

#### literary links with Daniel 4 and 5

We noted previously that the MT version of ch 5 relied strongly on its preceding story of Nebuchadnezzar's tree and the positive traditions about his reign for its effect. On the other hand, a court contest was not one of ̡'s concerns and there was little in the way of linking between chs 4 and 5. Despite that independence, the present story in the Septuagint shows traces of some literary links with both stories or at least with the tradition that produced their translation. The circular letter containing the king's confession in vv 26ff is a case in point. Darius' letter is addressed 'to the nations and regions and tongues' (v 26, τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ χώραις καὶ γλώσσαις) just as is Nebuchadnezzar's in ̡ 4.37b. This contrasts with the Theodotonic rendering of the Aramaic as λαοῖς, φυλαῖς, γλώσσαις both here and at 3.31/4.1, the MT equivalent of one of Nebuchadnezzar's confessions in the Septuagint. Similarly Darius in ̡ acknowledges the God who endures 'from generation to generation' (v 27, εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν) while Nebuchadnezzar uses almost the same phrase (4.37c, ἀπο γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς). This is distinct from the ̡ translation

---

<sup>70</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 151, recognizes this distinction between the versions.



of עַם-דָּר דָּר (MT 3.33) as εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν (θ 4.3).<sup>71</sup> Darius also speaks of the God who 'has redeemed' Daniel (v 28, ἐλυτρώσατο), which places the θ reader in mind of Nebuchadnezzar's 'time of redemption' (4.34, ἀπολυτρώσεως). Neither instance is represented in MT. Further links with θ ch 4 have already been explored in the section that considers the servanthood of Darius.

As far as ch 5 goes, the additional polemic against idols in θ has already been noted. There is also a common vocabulary for court figures that seems to operate between the chapters. We have seen that Daniel is referred to as the king's 'friend' (φίλον) in 6.14 by his fellow courtiers. In the previous chapter the same word is used, this time by Daniel, as a synonym for 'nobles' (5.23). In neither place is there an equivalent to this usage in MT. It seems to represent those who occupy some sort of position in the central administration and are close to the king.<sup>72</sup> It signifies the distinction in stance between the two stories in the Septuagint that in one Daniel condemns the king's friends and in the other he is described as such himself. The word seems to be equivalent to μεγιστᾶνές (5.23 and 6.18) or its Aramaic equivalent in both places, רַב־רַבִּין, and is common to both chapters.

The significance of these echoes should not be overdrawn, however. There are signs that the links between the Septuagint chapters are not clear cut. There are aspects of Nebuchadnezzar's confession that are not present in the shorter statement of Darius. For example the earlier king spoke of 'trembling from fear of him' (4.37a, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ τρόμος) in a block of θ plus material. That concept has not been included in the θ confession by Darius, but it is a phrase picked up in MT, where the king orders that his subjects will 'tremble and be afraid' (v 27, זָעַן וְדָחַל translated by θ as τρέμοντας καὶ φοβούμενος). The same phrase also occurs at MT 5.19, this time in MT plus material identically

---

<sup>71</sup>Theodotion shows a more literal rendering in that it preserves the sequence of elements found in Aramaic. See Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 296.

<sup>72</sup>See again Cassin, 141

phrased in Aramaic and almost identically in Greek by Θ. In neither place is it represented in the Septuagint. Likewise the 'signs and wonders' of both MT and Θ in chapter 4 also occur in MT v 28 (אֲתָן וְתִמְרוֹת) but are not present in Θ. It seems that there was some cross fertilization going on between the traditions, and lines cannot be drawn too firmly.<sup>73</sup> It needs to be acknowledged that there are themes and interests running between the stories, and probably an awareness of one by the other, yet the sort of clear literary dependence that can be discerned between the MT stories is more difficult to chart in Θ.

### conclusion

As with the previous two chapters studied, there is much that these two accounts of Darius and Daniel in the lion pit have in common. Both stories depict a Near Eastern monarch who is fooled into taking to himself functions that belong to God alone. In both this results in a test of faith for Daniel, whose God delivers him from the power of the lions, and by implication from the hand of the king and those conspiring against him. This results in judgement on those who sought to bring Daniel down, but Darius is preserved to acknowledge publicly the sovereignty of Daniel's God.

As also with previous studies, there are differences in the manner in which the story is told. The narrator provides more clues of his intention in Θ, where MT requires his reader to draw conclusions from the words and actions. This is seen in the way perspective is manipulated, motives of characters dealt with, and the story anticipated by the respective storytellers. Irony and suspense are central to the functioning of the MT narrative, where Θ is a more straightforward moral tale although not without its ironic aspects. The Septuagint takes a closer interest in the person of Darius. Daniel remains largely a silent, aloof figure perceived through the eyes of others in both versions, although when he finally does speak his role as a representative of judgement is more explicit in Θ.

---

<sup>73</sup>Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 37

The differences in the way the story is told reflect different concerns on the part of the versions. The Masoretic Text centres the conflict on the two laws so the climax of the story is a further ordinance, which admits the superiority of the law of God over the law of the Medes and the Persians. The Septuagint centres the conflict more around the arrogation of divine powers to himself by Darius. Consequently the climax of ⑤'s story is a confession of submission by Darius to the God whom he had been tricked into trying to usurp.

These differences in both narrative technique and theological concern broadly continue the differences that have already been discerned in chs 4 and 5, and in that respect neither version of the story can be said to stand alone. As exceptions to that, Daniel plays a more positive courtly role in this chapter than ⑤ has previously allowed him, and the attitude towards the king is more positive than was the case with Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Both these exceptions reflect an admission of the court contest on the part of ⑤ that has previously been absent. There is a greater interplay in ⑤ between this story and those of chs 4 and 5, than we saw between chs 4 and 5. However the confessional material reveals an interplay across versions as well as between chapters.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DANIEL 3

The Masoretic Text and Septuagint versions of Daniel 3 are both more alike and more different from one another than in chs 4-6. The Additions excepted, the Septuagint appears to spring from a *Vorlage* closer to MT than has been the case so far, and as a result the story is almost the same in the ordering of events and characters. Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego defy the king's order to worship a golden image, and are thrust into the fiery furnace as punishment after some Chaldeans draw the king's attention to their defiance. In the process those deputed to carry out the execution are themselves killed by the flames. Nebuchadnezzar witnesses their deliverance by some sort of heavenly intervention and responds in acknowledgment of the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego by issuing a second decree. This time he commands his subjects to worship the God of his Jewish subjects.

The major difference between the two accounts lies in the Additions and an examination of them is my first priority in a literary comparison of the Aramaic and Greek versions of Daniel 3.<sup>1</sup> Although the main focus is on the Masoretic Text and Septuagint versions, a feature of the present chapter is that Theodotion also includes the Additions and has a little more in common with the Septuagint of ch 3 than elsewhere in Daniel. Consequently ch 3 receives fuller treatment in the survey in Appendix One, the contents of which should be noted in conjunction with

---

<sup>1</sup>The Greek material between MT vv 23 and 24 is conventionally called the Additions. I use that term for convenience, although I will show in the course of my argument that the material is probably 'inserted' and so it is not inappropriate to speak of it as additional.

the discussion that follows. In treating the Prayer of Azariah, the Song of the Three and the narrative material linked to them, I do not propose to deal with them as discrete literary units.<sup>2</sup> Their survival in religious tradition speaks for the quality of the compositions. Instead I will consider whether the material is inserted in or original to the context in which we now find it, before looking at its effect on the narrative of ch 3 and on its theological or polemical concerns.

It will be seen that the issues so raised also pertain to other smaller narrative differences between MT and the Septuagint. A discussion of differences in narrative shape and perspective leads into a look at the repetition of lists and phrases particularly by the Masoretic Text, and the effect on the narrative when ⑤ summarizes lists or abbreviates formulae. The resultant difference means that the versions use different means to convey narrative perspective. It is also a contributing factor to a significantly different setting for each version of the story. A brief note on two literary devices used by the Aramaic will constitute the final part of the consideration of the narrative. This will lead into an examination of theological differences, which again links back to the earlier discussion of the Additions and focuses primarily on the problematical vv 16-18. The major issues of monotheism, idolatry, the nature of kingship, wisdom and angelology all recur, and the Septuagint's polemical concerns on these matters are consistent with what has already been seen.

The final section will examine the links between this chapter and the previous ones studied, 4-6. This builds particularly on the work done for ch 6 and discovers that genre is not the only aspect that chs 3 and 6 have in common in MT. While there are links with chs 4 and 5 also, the strongest ties are with the story of Daniel in the lion pit. In contrast ⑤ ch 3 seems to form a pair with ch 4 in a manner appropriate to the chapter order witnessed in P967 (1-4, 7-8, 5-6, 9-12). This has interesting connotations for the way the versions diverge in their treatment of Nebuchadnezzar, especially when other royal confessions in

---

<sup>2</sup>For examples of such treatments see Moore, Daubney, or Gilbert, 'La Prière d'Azarias'.

Daniel are taken into account.

### the Additions: narrative insertions?

Most of the issues of this chapter are brought to the surface in a discussion of the Greek Additions. In particular the question of whether or not they may be properly described as insertions in the Masoretic Text provides us with a useful starting point. It has been suggested that there is a problem with the flow of the MT narrative in vv 23f. Verse 23 seems to be redundant to the action and v 24 follows on too quickly from what has preceded it. It appears that there is something missing in the story between vv 23 and 24.<sup>3</sup> Still others go on to wonder if perhaps the prose interlude between the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three (vv 46-51) represents that missing part of the Semitic narrative.<sup>4</sup>

The first question to be asked is whether or not vv 46-51 is a likely continuation of the narrative in MT. A comparison of the depiction of characters in the two sections suggests that it is not. § v 24 refers to 'Hananiah and Azariah and Mishael' (Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαριᾶς καὶ Μισαήλ) although the focus shifts in v 25 to Azariah as the central figure and the other two are 'his companions' (τοῖς συνεταίροις αὐτοῦ). This nomenclature is maintained in v 49 where reference is made to 'those with Azariah' (τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀζαριᾶν) without naming his companions, and later simply to 'the three' (v 51, οἱ τρεῖς). The Masoretic Text never uses the Semitic names of the heroes, nor does it focus on one of them in particular. When they are named (vv 13f, 16, 19f, 22, 26 and 28-30) all three are listed in exactly the same order each time. Apart from early references to them as Judeans (v 8, רִי יְהוּדִיָּא, v 12, גַּבְרִין יְהוּדָאִין), the men are almost always referred to as 'these men' (vv 12, 21 and 27, גַּבְרִיָּא אֵלֶּךְ). MT never speaks of 'the three' as a collective noun in the way that the § Addition does. The reference to 'three men' (v 24, גַּבְרִין חֲלָתָא) and 'these three men' (v 23, גַּבְרִיָּא אֵלֶּךְ חֲלָתָא) is not equivalent, since the emphasis in these particular instances is on the

---

<sup>3</sup>For example Delcor, *Daniel*, 105.

<sup>4</sup>For example Hartman and DiLella, 159f, and Rothstein, 175. See also other references in Moore, 41.

number 'three' as contrasted with the four figures that Nebuchadnezzar sees in the furnace.

The Additions also contain a different description of the functional characters who bind and despatch Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to the flames and then are themselves consumed. The Septuagint appears to render the idiomatic Aramaic phrase for warriors (v 20, גְּבוּרֵי-חַיִל) literally into ἄνδρες ἰσχυροτάτους. The implication in both languages is of members of an elite group. Other biblical examples of this type of correspondence may be found. In 1 Chr 8.40 the sons of Ulam are spoken of with approval as גְּבוּרֵי-חַיִל in MT and ἰσχυροὶ ἄνδρες in the Septuagint. Pr 30.30 uses the expression as an image of the lion. The Hebrew refers to it as גְּבוּר 'among the beasts' (בְּבֵהֵמָה), while the Greek describes the lion as ἰσχυρότερος. Although the syntax is different, these examples confirm the general sense evoked by the words used to describe the executioners in both languages of Daniel 3. This impression of an elite group is reinforced in 5 v 22 where those same men are described literally as 'hand-picked' (προχειρισθέντες). The prose interlude in the Greek Additions, however, describes them simply as 'labourers of the king' (v 46, ὑπηρέται τοῦ βασιλέως). Normally the word in Septuagintal Greek denotes the ordinary (Wisdom 13.11) or subservient (Wisdom 19.6). Its only biblical occurrence with an attested Semitic equivalent is in Is 32.5 where its Hebrew equivalent is כִּילִי, the sense of which is perhaps best captured by the Old English word 'knave'. It is also in parallel with μῶρος. In sum, the executioners of v 46 are from quite a different class of functionary than those described in v 20.

As well as Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, and the executioners, another 'character' that appears in the prose segments of the Additional material is the furnace. Mostly the furnace is described along similar lines to the Aramaic with fairly consistent use of the phrase, τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην (vv 6, 11, 15 and 20). The consistency lies more in the vocabulary used than in the exact reproduction of the whole phrase. Throughout the chapter κάμιнос depicts the 'furnace'. In the parts that coincide with the Aramaic tradition, the whole expression is not always used but there is no variation in the vocabulary (vv 17 and 20). In the Additional material there is different vocabulary and the same vocabulary used differently. Specifically the word φλόξ is



introduced (vv 23, 47, 49 and 88), and participles are intensified with prefixes (v 23, ἐνεπύρισε, and v 25, ὑποκαιομένης).

An examination of the flow of the narrative sheds further light on the question. Both versions are in substantial agreement up until v 22. They state that the furnace was heated to excess and even agree in their description of the king's decree as 'pressing' (v 22 MT, **מִשְׁפָּח**; **Θ**, ἥπειγεν). Up to this point they appear to be following a common tradition. From v 22b, however, there are differences. MT has the flames kill those bearing Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego and then they fall bound into the furnace (v 23). In **Θ** the men bind them and throw them into the furnace again, and in v 23 the furnace kills the executioners but the heroes are watched over. The Septuagint does not mention the young men by name at all except to refer to one of them by his Hebrew name, Azariah (v 23, Ἀζαριαν). This is in marked contrast to MT which mentions the three in full twice in the equivalent verses. In light of the earlier discussion on names, this suggests that from v 22b onwards the present form of **Θ** reflects the same tradition behind the prose narrative of the Additions. Therefore the relationship of Additional prose material to vv 21-23 needs to be considered in two parts. The first stage is to examine the flow of the prose narrative in the **Θ** version when the song and the prayer are removed, so that vv 46-50 follow immediately on v 23 and precede v 24/91. The second is to insert **Θ** vv 46-50 into the same place in the Masoretic Text, between vv 23 and 24, and to look at the effect on the narrative as we have it in MT.

Problems become immediately apparent when the narrative flow of vv 21-23, 46-50, 24/91 is considered in **Θ**. The men are thrown into the furnace twice (vv 21f) and each time the same root verb, βάλλω, is used, although the second time it is prefixed by the translator or writer. Then the executioners are killed twice (vv 23 and 48), and the stoking of the furnace is described twice (vv 22 and 46f). On the second mention, the work of the firemen and the resulting flames are described in some detail. As well as the apparent repetition, there is a difference in narrative detail on the second time of telling. In the prose section of the Additions, apart from the fact already noted that the executioners are of lower status, the same group who throw Azariah and his companions into the fire are responsible for maintaining its heat. This is made

quite explicit with the participial expression 'who threw them in' (v 46, οἱ...ἐμβάλλοντες αὐτοὺς). It is not at all clear that these are the same ones who are killed by the flames in v 48. They are described there simply as 'those of the Chaldeans found near the furnace' (οὓς εὑρε περὶ τὴν κάμινον τῶν Χαλδαίων). Incidentally it is unlikely that any identification is intended of these Chaldeans and those who earlier had slandered the young Judeans (v 8). Moreover the question of what made Nebuchadnezzar stand up for a closer look remains unclear. The Septuagint suggests first that it was because he heard the singing (v 91, ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν βασιλέα ὑμνοῦντων αὐτῶν). However in the following verse, in agreement with MT, the king's direct speech centres on the fact that the men are no longer bound and that there are four of them (v 25/92, ἄνδρας τέσσαρας λελυμένους). Nebuchadnezzar's speech does not seem to follow from what precedes it and is incomprehensible if divorced from the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three.

Another possibility is that the tradition behind the MT narrative once included the material contained in ̣ vv 46-50. One way to test that idea is to place ̣ vv 46-50 between MT vv 21-23 and MT v 24. Similar problems in the shape of the narrative as above arise when this is done. The executioners are killed and Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego fall bound into the fire (vv 22f). Immediately following this is the statement that those 'who threw them in' (v 46) carried on stoking the furnace. On those grounds the material in vv 46-50 does not seem to fit easily with the MT narrative. Against that however there is a less forced progression on to v 24/91 MT than the Septuagint of that verse. The king's reaction 'in trepidation' (בְּהִתְבַּהֲלֻת) is more readily understood as a response to the action of the angel of the Lord in vv 49-50. The implication of the king's concerns in MT v 24/91 is that he sees the results of the angel's activities, namely that the three prisoners are now loose and unharmed in the flames and a fourth figure is with them. However the problem of the names of the three heroes and the description of the executioners remains.

On balance it seems unlikely that the present form of ̣ vv 46-50 ever existed in the immediate precursor to the present Masoretic Text. If the Additional narrative material was ever part of the MT tradition,

it has left no trace in the present form of the text.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the way characters are perceived and the narrative shaped by ⑤ in the material where the two versions diverge (vv 22b-24/91) indicates that this particular representation of the tradition is closely tied to the poetic material. As a discussion of the contents of the Additional material will show, the Greek Additions are probably a later insertion into the story of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.<sup>6</sup> In this instance, in contrast to chs 4 and 6, it is unlikely that the Septuagint draws us closer to an *Ursprung* containing a more expansive account of angelic activity in the furnace.<sup>7</sup>

### the Additions as part of the narrative

Insertion of the Additions into the tradition represented by MT also affects the wider narrative of the Septuagint. The first thing to note is that the portrayal of time is distorted by the insertion. There is now too long a period between when the three young men are pitched into the furnace and the king's discovery that they are alive and well and have a companion with them.<sup>8</sup> The difference in pace between objective

---

<sup>5</sup>The debate over the existence or otherwise of a Semitic original of the Additions is not germane to the present discussion. Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 36, and Daubney, 46, point to the close coincidence of ⑤ and ⑥ in the poetic material in support of a Semitic original. Schmitt, 29, is not so sure. Gaster, 'The Unknown Aramaic Original', 75, and *Jerahmeel*, lv, is convinced that *Jerahmeel's* Aramaic version of the Song of the Three was original, and has recently received some support from Koch, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze*, 38. Harrington, 3f, says the *Jerahmeel* material is a retroversion, while Schurer, III, 326 and 330, sees it as a retranslation from the Latin. Bennett, 627, summarizes the position neatly: '...there is not much that could not have been written in Hellenistic Greek, and nothing that cannot have been translated from Hebrew.'

<sup>6</sup>Bogaert, 'Daniel 3 LXX', 11 and 17, considers the supplements were inserted by a Maccabean translator. In this regard see the comment of Rothstein, 174, that v 88 was probably an insertion into an older song designed to make it fit the present context.

<sup>7</sup>The suggestion of Sanders, 343, that fire-walking in an ecstatic state lies behind our story is highly unlikely as it ignores too many other details in the story. But see also Bickerman, 89.

<sup>8</sup>Wills, 86, notes they are in the furnace 'for what seems to be an eternity'.

time and literary time has become too great.<sup>9</sup> In order not to have credulity strained too far, the reader must concentrate on the prayer and song for their own sakes and put to one side the existence of the wider narrative of which they form a part.<sup>10</sup> There are occasions when difference in pace can be exploited to create suspense but such is not the case here because the narrator has already anticipated events with the editorial aside, 'but they were kept' (v 23, αὐτοὶ δὲ συνετηρήθησαν).

The second major literary effect of the insertion of the Additions is that it shifts the centre of the narrative. As we will see below, vv 16-18 of the Masoretic Text function effectively as the central point in the story, the moment at which the issues crystallize. The language of the Septuagint works to similar effect as the two versions are extremely close at this point. Yet vv 16ff seem off centre in *Θ*, particularly as the tension created by the conditional clause in v 17 is soon dissipated by the anticipation of events in v 23. The positioning of the Additions and their length relative to the rest of ch 3 means that the centre shifts to the prayer and song even though their links with the story of the fiery furnace are at best tenuous.

#### **differing interests of the Additions**

The most obvious incongruity of the Additions with the story surrounding them is in the concerns that motivate them. The penitential tone of the Prayer of Azariah is notable in this regard. The entire prayer is a collective and vicarious expression of national guilt before God with hardly a trace of Azariah's own dilemma. At least the comparable instance of the prayer of Jonah (Jon 2.2-9) is couched in personal terms with a veiled reference by Jonah to his own crisis.<sup>11</sup> Reference to being made 'the smallest of all the nations' (v 37, ἐσμικρύνθημεν παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) and to the absence of 'ruler and prophet nor leader' (v 38, ἄρχων καὶ προφήτης οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος) makes clear

---

<sup>9</sup>See Bar-Efrat, 143ff, on the distinction between 'objective time' and 'literary time'.

<sup>10</sup>Rothstein, 173

<sup>11</sup>Daubney, 39

that the heroes speak on behalf of the nation. Just punishment has come upon a sinful people (v 31) in the form of oppression by a king 'unrighteous and the most evil in all the earth' (v 32, ἀδίκῳ καὶ πονηροτάτῳ παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν). The guilt of God's people is not a concern of the Masoretic Text and the test facing Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego is more one of personal faithfulness in a foreign land than of national crisis.<sup>12</sup> The aspect of national guilt is more a feature of the later chapters of Daniel in MT, as witnessed in the confession of Daniel in 9.4-20, a prayer similar to Azariah's.<sup>13</sup>

At v 39 the prayer does become personal with talk of a 'shattered soul and humbled spirit' (ψυχῇ συντετριμμένη καὶ πνεύματι τεταπεινωμένη), and the lament for the lost cultic sacrifice (v 38) is linked to the three companions' own self-sacrifice in the fire (v 40).<sup>14</sup> It thereby becomes a kind of atonement. The interest in patriarchal history (v 35) and the well-being of Jerusalem (v 28) relate to this concern for the political and cultic life of the nation (v 38). Indeed it has been pointed out that whenever the patriarchs are listed in this unusual way the context is cultic (Ex 32.13, 1 Ki 18.36, 1 Chr 29.18 and 2 Chr 30.6).<sup>15</sup> Even in the more universalist Song of the Three, the temple theme may be detected early on with τῷ ναῷ (v 53) and χερουβὶμ (v 55). The song is directed towards Israel (v 83) and her cultic officials (v 84, ἱερεῖς, and v 85, δοῦλοι), and ultimately towards the hebraically named Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael (v 88). The use of Hebrew names perhaps emphasizes their Palestinian Jewish concerns, in contrast to the courtly figures of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the Babylonian or Persian diaspora. This difference in content adds further weight to the argument that the Additions in their entirety may fairly be described as insertions.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Young, *Daniel*, 91, notes that the Jews' reply in MT vv 17-18 is at a considerable remove from Maccabean nationalism.

<sup>13</sup>Daubney, 58. See also Gilbert, 563, for a detailed comparison.

<sup>14</sup>Gilbert, 579

<sup>15</sup>Gilbert, 569

<sup>16</sup>Moore, 24, describes them as intrusive and secondary.

### narrative shape

If that is indeed the case the MT story should function satisfactorily in its present form. The section that has been the object of most discussion about the Masoretic Text narrative is vv 23f. The implication of v 21 is that Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego have been thrown into the furnace and the information follows that those who bound them and threw them in were killed in the process. Then comes v 23 which seems only to repeat what was conveyed two verses earlier. With hardly a pause for the reader to register what has happened to the three young men, the focus shifts to Nebuchadnezzar whom we are told 'was startled and stood up in trepidation' (v 24, **תהו וקם בהתבהלה**). All this is conveyed with no hint as to what has caused such a response on the part of the king. There is an apparent flaw in the depiction of time as it does not seem possible that Nebuchadnezzar has had time to see, let alone respond to, anything.

Yet the functioning of these two verses in the narrative as it is now found in MT, while surprising, displays several of the characteristics that we have come to expect from the teller of the Aramaic stories in Daniel. Instead of being redundant, v 23 can be thought of as serving a resumptive purpose that leads into the next stage of the narrative.<sup>17</sup> The result is a necessary pause that contains, but does not describe, the passage of time leading up to the king's reactions in v 24. The Masoretic Text fills the time while the three are languishing in the furnace by reinforcing two important facts about what has just happened to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. The first one is that there were three of them who fell into the furnace. This is the only time in MT ch 3 where Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego are referred to as 'these three men' (v 23, **גבריא אלך תלתין**). Elsewhere, as we have noted above, they are either named or referred to as 'these men'. The result of this change in formula is a particular emphasis on the number. The second key item in the description is that they were 'bound'

---

<sup>17</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 66. Compare Charles, *Daniel*, 72, who brackets out v 23 entirely.



(מכפחין). The participle is particularly emphasized by being disentangled from the formulaic phrase '(they) fell into the midst of the furnace of burning fire' (נפלו לגא-אחין-נורא יקדחא) and placed at the end of the sentence. This description foreshadows Nebuchadnezzar's question in the following verse, 'Did we not throw three men (גברין חלחא) into the midst of the fire bound (מכפחין)?'. Again the adjective 'bound' is placed emphatically.

Another effect of v 23 is that it builds suspense by shifting the focus of the narrative away from the protagonists at a crucial moment. At the end of v 22 we are told that the heat killed 'these men who took up' (גבריא אלך די הסקן) Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. The obvious question arising from that — what happened to the intended victims? — is not addressed. Instead we get an intrusive reminder of things we already know. The suspense continues into v 24 when Nebuchadnezzar starts up from where he was seated and questions his officials.<sup>18</sup> The camera remains focused on the person of the king and not his victims, while the reader's curiosity is whetted by the king's line of questioning. We only find out what has happened in the furnace when the king lets us in on what he has already seen, that the men are alive and unbound and there are now four of them. As when Daniel was in the lion pit (ch 6), the reader does not find out what happened in the hour of danger until it is revealed from the point of view of the king. There is a difference, though, in that the king knows before the reader whereas in 6.21 reader and king find out at the same time. Yet the same covert narratorial manipulation of perspective to build and maintain suspense operates in both stories. This contrasts with the Septuagint account which answers the obvious question that MT leaves tantalizingly unanswered: 'But they were kept' (v 23, αὐτοὶ δὲ συνετηρήθησαν). The result is the same anticipation of the story by the narrator observable in ch 6.

The usage of the words ארין and ענה in v 24 is also typical of MT narrative in the Daniel stories. The former normally indicates a change

---

<sup>18</sup> An example of variation in psychological time within a narrative to heighten tension. See Bar-Efrat, 161, on this aspect of biblical narrative.



of scene and almost always occurs at the beginning of a verse. This was seen in ch 6 where it marks a series of rapid scene changes. It may also denote that what follows is in some measure dependent on what has gone before, without always defining exactly how. This lack of a range of connectives, such as is available in English, at times brings about a hiatus in the narrative that the storyteller is able to exploit. We have already seen an example of this at 5.13 where Daniel enters the banqueting hall after the queen advises Belshazzar to call him. The use of **בְּאֵין** leaves it unclear whether or not the queen had issued an order over the authority of the king. In the present context also a gap is created in the narrative by **אֵין**, signalling an abrupt change in focus and an uncertainty as to what exactly has upset Nebuchadnezzar. The same sort of surprise shift in the narrative also occurred earlier between vv 7 and 8. Just as the Chaldeans began to 'eat pieces of' the three heroes before the reader knows why, so here Nebuchadnezzar is 'startled and stood up in trepidation' (v 24, **תָּוָה וְקָם בְּהִתְבַּהֲלָה**) before the reason for his surprise is clear. Thus the suspense already noted in this section of narrative is heightened. At the same time the untranslatable **עֲנָה** precedes the king's speech to his officials. The word is used to indicate a response or reaction to what immediately precedes it and is not necessarily an 'answer' to another character's speech. The result is a strong hint that what the king is about to say relates directly to what he saw in the furnace. But still the reader waits to know what that is.

Another much-discussed section of ch 3 is vv 15-18. Earlier I suggested that this is a central moment in the development of the conflict. It is the moment when Nebuchadnezzar betrays his deepest motives: 'what god is there who will rescue you from my hand?' (v 15, **מִן־הָאֱלֹהִים דִּי יִשְׁמַכְנֹכּוּ מִן־יָדִי**). And it is the time when Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego reach the point of no return with 'we will not serve your gods' (v 18, **לֹא־אֵחָדָם לֹא־אֵחָדָם פִּלְחִין**). In a curious twist this central point of the narrative becomes an anticlimax because the test that the list of musical instruments has been building towards is never actually put to the three heroes.<sup>19</sup> What we get instead is the famous unresolved protasis containing again the list of musical instruments

---

<sup>19</sup>Good, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy', 51

followed by the statement from Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego that there is nothing to discuss (vv 15f).<sup>20</sup> It is that action and not their failure to respond to the music that is the final straw for Nebuchadnezzar. It is as though the sound and fury of the idol's dedication is trivialized by the tranquility of the moment when the choice between masters is recognized (vv 16-18). The Masoretic Text expresses this in terms of service. Setting aside for the moment the complexities of v 17a, in the speech of the Jewish rebels, allegiance to the God whom they 'serve' (v 17, **פִּלְחִין**) entails their refusal to 'serve' (v 18, **פִּלְחִין**) the gods of Nebuchadnezzar. Once the moment has passed and its significance sunk in, the emotional and physical temperature of the narrative rises again as Nebuchadnezzar is 'filled with fury' (v 19, **הִתְכַּלִּי חֵמָה**). As a result of the king's failure to put the test of the music to the Judeans, the furnace becomes the test itself rather than the consequence of failure.

The same twist in the tale is present in  $\mathfrak{G}$ . The difference is that with the absence of the full orchestra at this point the build up is muted and so the twist to the tale is less startling. Likewise the issue of service is not carried forward with the same repetition of key words as is the case with the MT use of **פִּלַח**. Theodotion reflects this with his consistent choice of  $\lambda α τ ρ ε \acute{\upsilon} \omega$ . Despite the use of  $\lambda α τ ρ ε \acute{\upsilon} \omega$  in vv 14 and 18, the Septuagint chooses  $\phi ο β \acute{\epsilon} \omega$  instead in v 17. Both of these points will be treated in greater depth when the use of repetition is compared and the differing theological emphases examined.

While one possible response to vv 23f in the Masoretic Text is that there is a gap in the narrative because something is missing, another is to see the gap as a deliberate piece of narrative technique. The result is that, at least in literary terms, the Masoretic Text can be seen as a coherent piece of narrative in its present form.<sup>21</sup> The importance of the young men's meeting with King Nebuchadnezzar (vv 15-18) as a key episode in the story is also reinforced by the shape of the Masoretic Text

---

<sup>20</sup>Some suggest a facial expression or gesture on the part of the Jews as a reason for the aposiopesis. See for example Stuart, 87, and Charles, *Daniel*, 68.

<sup>21</sup>Of vv 21-25, Torrey, 'Notes', 264, says, 'I see no reason for doubting that its original author wrote it in just this way.'

narrative.

### narrative perspective

These central verses also provide a starting point in an examination of the manipulation of perspective by the storyteller. It is an astonishing feature of the MT narrative that Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego hardly utter a word.<sup>22</sup> They say nothing in the build up to the central meeting with the king (vv 16-18) and nothing after they emerge from the furnace. Like Daniel in ch 6, they refrain from any condemnation of the king. Even their short affirmation of faith is ambiguous in content if not in courage. The storyteller leaves the reader to decide that the Judean heroes' attitude is also the narrator's, because Nebuchadnezzar himself comes to recognize it.

As in the other stories examined, the MT narrator is covert in that he does not anticipate the story. This may be further illustrated by the progress of the action from v 8. Up until that point Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego have not entered the story and their presence at the plain of Dura is only by implication. The narrator does not let us see their act of defiance. Instead he brings them into the story through the agency of the Chaldeans whom we are told 'ate pieces of the Judeans' (v 8, אכלו קדציהון די יהודיא) in an audience with the king. Even then the reason for the slander is not told. They are not mentioned by name until the end of the sycophantic speech and then only with the preface, 'men of Judah' (v 12, גברין יהודאין) and the reminder to the king that he had appointed them. Finally, through the agency of the Chaldeans, the reader hears the crime of which they are accused. Only then does the focus shift to King Nebuchadnezzar as his reaction to this new knowledge is documented (vv 13ff). Events in the furnace are also seen through the eyes of the king. The reader is only allowed to see what the king can see. The person of King Nebuchadnezzar is central to the operation of perspective as every scene either observes him or is observed by him, and the action unfolds as he sees it. This incidentally is a literary argument to add to the others above in favour of the integrity of the

---

<sup>22</sup>Fewell, 82

Masoretic Text as it stands.

There is less opportunity for a covert narrator to project his point of view in the present chapter. There is still a significant amount of direct speech but less varied repetition between speakers and between speaker and narrator. Such variation is an important means for manipulation of perspective, but is not employed in the story of the three young men. Instead the narrator uses the repetition of identical formulae. When such phrases or lists or formulae occur both in narrative sections and in the mouths of characters, they become a vehicle for irony. The narrator of this chapter is dependent on that irony being understood in the portrayal of his point of view, as we will see in the sections on irony and repetition below.

The account in  $\mathfrak{G}$  is substantially the same as MT except at key points that we have examined. The balance between narrative and dialogue is similar so perspective is conveyed in the same way. The major difference, apart from ones relating to the Additions, is found in the summarizing tendency of  $\mathfrak{G}$ . The resulting difference in the degree of irony present could have meant some ambiguity in perspective. In fact the Additions ensure that such is not the case. In the first place the narrator becomes more visible in  $\mathfrak{G}$  once the traditions begin to diverge at v 22. The contrast between the people of Nebuchadnezzar and the people of God, implicit in MT, is explicit in v 23 with the information that, unlike the executioners, Azariah and his friends 'were kept' (συνετηρήθησαν). Not only does this comment direct the sympathies of the reader, it also anticipates the safety of the three men. The more editorially omniscient  $\mathfrak{G}$  narrator also takes us right into the furnace in the Additional interlude for a physical description of the angelic activity (vv 49f). As well as bringing the reader on side with the narrator, this section renders mundane an episode that remains inscrutable in the Masoretic Text story. A similar effect was noted in ch 4 when the dimensions of the tree are expressed by  $\mathfrak{G}$  in terms of stadia (4.12).

At the point where the Septuagint and MT begin to converge again on each other (v 24/91), there is a further anticipation of the narrative. Unlike the Masoretic Text,  $\mathfrak{G}$  tells the reader the king started up from

his seat 'when (he) heard them singing praises' (ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν βασιλέα ὑμνούντων αὐτῶν). Immediately we are granted the information that he 'saw them living' (ἐθεώρει αὐτοὺς ζῶντας). Only then does he address his question to his companions (v 25/92). The MT reader must wait till the king begins to speak (v 25) to know the reason for his 'trepidation' (תַּהֲבִתָּהּ).

In the meantime the three have a great deal to say once they are in the fire, in contrast to their counterparts in MT. In the context in which the prayer is made, the description of 'a king unrighteous and the most evil in all the earth' (v 32, βασιλεῖ ἀδίκῳ καὶ πονηροτάτῳ παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν) is an explicit condemnation of Nebuchadnezzar, although the original *Sitz im Leben* may well have had a different monarch in mind. Such condemnation as the Masoretic Text contains is implicit in the attitude adopted by Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, and is reliant on the narrator's skill at winning the reader's sympathy for that attitude. The Septuagint focuses on God's ability to act rather than on the young men's courage. This point relates to Ἡ's treatment of the difficult vv 17f, to which I return below. Suffice to say for now that the characters in Ἡ are little more than vehicles for the narrator's monotheistic confession. To some extent they play the same sort of passive role as Daniel in Ἡ ch 4, where Nebuchadnezzar's viewpoint dominates the story. In the Masoretic Text, because God's willingness to intervene still hangs in the balance, the focus is more on the courage of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. In a way, the narrator as so often in Ἡ anticipates the narrative in that there is little room for doubt that God will act and that Nebuchadnezzar will capitulate.

### the repeated lists

No discussion of the story of the fiery furnace is complete without reference to the amount of repetitive material in ch 3. Nowhere in Daniel is the Semitic narrative habit of making lists used to such marked effect as in the present story. But the effect comes not so much in the lists themselves as in the way they are repeated several times. It is hardly possible to read Daniel 3 without being struck by the importance of the two major lists to the narrative, nor to read a commentary on Daniel without encountering a detailed treatment of those lists item by

item. Repetition as literary device is also used for certain words and phrases other than the lists. The practice of Septuagintal narrators of summarizing repetition is a notable feature of 5 in this chapter, and results in significant differences in the narrative of the two versions.

The first list is of imperial officials summoned to the 'image of gold' (v 1, **צֶלֶם דִּי־דָהֵב** in MT, *εἰκόνα χρυσεῖν* in 5). It appears in v 2 and is repeated by MT in whole in v 3 and in part in v 27. The form of the list of officials in the Aramaic is reproduced exactly each time, including the **ו** before the third item (vv 2f, 'and governors', **וּפְחוּתָא**). Most commentators agree that this suggests a group of different status comprising the 'satraps, prefects and governors' (**אֲחֶשְׁדֶּרְפִּיָּא סַגְיָא וּפְחוּתָא**).<sup>23</sup> That possibility is rendered the more likely when the same group appears in v 27 to witness the miraculous deliverance. At the same time the earlier and fuller enumerations of officials are recalled.

The Septuagint omits the second full list of officials entirely, being content to refer the reader back to 'the aforementioned' (v 3, οἱ προγεγραμμένοι). The aforementioned in question are not quite the same people as those spoken of in the Masoretic Text. To begin with there are only five items noted before the summarizing phrase, 'all those in authority over...' (v 2, τοὺς ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν κατὰ), although the first three are agreed upon by each version. At first glance the use of καὶ appears to be indiscriminate but closer examination suggests that the different distribution of καὶ results in different groupings. It looks as if 'governors and courtiers' (τοπάρχας καὶ ὑπάτους) is a single grouping, and so is 'administrators and all those in authority...' (διοικητὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν). This puts satraps and prefects on their own as separate items at the head of the list in contrast to the trio of MT. Also in contrast to MT they do not appear at all in 5 v 94. Instead one of the other groupings from v 2, 'courtiers, governors' (ὑπατοι τοπάρχαι) is mentioned again, and then two other categories otherwise absent from the story arrive on stage. They are the

---

<sup>23</sup>See for example Hartman and DiLella, 156f, on Persian administrative terms.



'hereditary leaders and friends of the king' (ἀρχιπατριῶται καὶ οἱ φίλοι τοῦ βασιλέως). The first term has only one other occurrence in the Greek Old Testament (Josh 21.1). 'Friends' of the king also features in 5.23 as those who shared with Belshazzar in the events of the banquet, and Daniel is described by his enemies as a 'friend' of the king (Ἔ 6.14). Some courtly role is probably in mind for those so described. Beyond that general statement, no pattern seems to emerge in the way the Ἔ translator handles titles. As in chapter 6, it is possible that he is working from a different *Vorlage*, but more likely that he has no clear idea of what distinctions there may have been between such titles.

The second list is of musical instruments, which first appears in MT v 5 and is repeated almost exactly in vv 7, 10 and 15. Inexplicably there is one item missing in the text of v 7. Theodotion either assumes it should be there or testifies to a *Vorlage* before its mistaken omission. There are other textual problems with this particular item (סומפניה). In vv 10 and 15 there is a ketiv / qere issue and a ם is appended.<sup>24</sup> It would seem that even in the early stages of the tradition the meaning of the word was unclear. It certainly was for the versions. The omission in v 7 MT will be treated as accidental in the present literary comparison, and the textual problems surrounding the ם will be assumed to be a product of this confusion over meaning.<sup>25</sup> In the Septuagint the series of musical instruments is only cited in full at the first appearance (v 5). Subsequent mentions are all in the summary form, 'the sound of the horn and all the sounding of music' (vv 7 and 10, τῆς φωνῆς τῆς σάλπιγγος καὶ παντὸς ἤχου μουσικῶν), in much the same way the

---

<sup>24</sup>This suggests a case could be made for סומפניה as a collective musical term. See Mitchell and Joyce, 25f. Against this the biblical Greek cognate verb συμφωνέω is a political one and is never used in a musical context (Gen 14.3, 4 Ki 12.9, Is 7.2, 4 Mac 14.6). It is also difficult to see why two collective terms would occur next to each other. On balance, I assume a particular musical instrument as the meaning of סומפניה / συμφωνή, and translate it as 'bagpipes' in the absence of a better idea. Mitchell and Joyce's suggestion of a percussion instrument seems not to have won much support.

<sup>25</sup>The variation between ם and װ in the spelling of the fourth instrument was a common vacillation in Biblical Aramaic, where the movement from װ to ם was in process, and for our purposes only needs to be noted. See Rosenthal, 16. Mitchell and Joyce, 24, consider this vacillation indicates a word of foreign origin.



officials are summarized in v 3. There is one small variation in that  $\phi\omega\nu\eta\varsigma$  is not present in v 15. Apart from discrepancies in the distribution of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , the list is an exact copy of that in both MT and  $\Theta$ . There is not enough evidence to suppose the use of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  in  $\Theta$  denotes an attempt to group the musical instruments. Unlike the case with the list of officials, the Septuagint translator seems clear about the meaning of each of the terms in his *Vorlage* with the possible exception of the final item.

As a result, the difference between versions in the literary effects of the list is limited. Each list or a summary of it appears at identical points in the narrative and is mentioned by the same speakers in both  $\Theta$  and MT. The chief point of comparison comes in a consideration of the effectiveness or otherwise of the word for word repetition in the Masoretic Text. Any effect thereby noted will necessarily be absent in the summarizing Septuagint story. This type of repetition is exceptional in late Biblical Hebrew, and is different from others that we have looked at elsewhere in Daniel.<sup>26</sup> Apart from matters that point to text transmission issues, there is little variation in the tellings.

Most obviously, each repetition of a series emphasizes the point being made the first time the list is produced. It becomes unforgettable in this story that all officialdom was to be present for the dedication of the statue without exception (v 1), and that the command was obeyed without exception (v 2). The presence of a summary item at the end of both lists ensures that this is so. Immediately the scene is set for the conflict, and suspense begins to build as the list is repeated. Similarly, on the first occasion on which the music list is enunciated the herald is the speaker and those in the foregoing list are the listeners. The message requires from them instant obedience (v 5,  $\text{בעֲדָנָא}$ ), and the sound of the instruments is both the signal for and test of that obedience. Moreover, cultic overtones foreshadow the exact test to which they are being put, as the repetition of the series of instruments emphasizes the ritual setting within which the conflict of

---

<sup>26</sup>Savran, 110

loyalties will be resolved.<sup>27</sup> After that every sounding of the music is protracted by the recital of the complete ensemble. Each one reminds the reader of the choice facing the worshippers and increases the sense of anticipation. Finally on the fourth and last occasion (v 15) the moment of truth arrives.

There is also an expression of immediacy present in the Septuagint. The Aramaic **בערנה** of v 5 is not quite so strongly expressed with the Greek **ὅταν**, meaning 'when' or 'whenever'. 'At that time' (v 7, **ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ**) is if anything more emphatic than the Masoretic Text's **בה־זמנא** (v 7), and the difference at v 5 may well be understood as **ט**'s attempt to express in translation the difference between Aramaic **ערנא** (v 5) and **זמנא** (v 7). In other respects, however, the summarizing of the lists means that the **ט** story is told in more muted tones than is its Aramaic counterpart. The result is a different kind of story, as will become clearer when we look at the tone and setting of each in more detail.

#### repetition of the lists as comedy

Another important effect of the repetition of ch 3 is that it brings an element of parody into the story, and in so doing becomes a vehicle for the covert narrator's point of view. Diverse commentators agree on its presence and have described it in different ways.<sup>28</sup> The comedic effect noted in ch 6 is different in that it is achieved more by the movements of characters and the narrative description of those movements. Here the humour rests in words rather than action and is found primarily in the repetition of long lists of officials and musical instruments. In this case, the deployment of the lists emphasizes the absurdity of what

---

<sup>27</sup>Coxon, 'The "List" Genre', 103

<sup>28</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 55: 'la partie haggadique.' Porteous, 60, sees 'an element of caricature'. Wills, 80, speaks of the story's 'essentially comic nature'. Baldwin, 102, uses the term 'satire'. However contrast Goldingay, *Daniel*, 68. In his study of 'idol parodies' Roth, 21ff, does not include Dan 3 and 6 directly, but he does link them with Bel and the Dragon, which he says is an actualization of the genre.

is going on.<sup>29</sup> The picture painted is of an unquestioning mechanistic acceptance of the commands issued.<sup>30</sup> Because the repetition of lists is so exact, compared to the subtle variations we have detected elsewhere, the story becomes a parody on Nebuchadnezzar and his administrators.<sup>31</sup> An impression of order is conveyed, the better to expose the false basis of that order.<sup>32</sup>

The frequency of expressions for immediacy, by reinforcing the mechanistic response that is expected and given, also reinforces the parody.<sup>33</sup> The Aramaic organizes its three words for time in a significant manner. The herald (vv 5f) tells the assembly to fall and worship 'at the appointed time' (בְּעֵתָא). He then follows up with the threat to any who do not do so 'in that moment' (v 6, בְּהִשְׁעָתָא). This time the word used is a more general one indicating an immediate response to the pre-arranged signal understood by עֵתָא. The narrator takes over in vv 7f, and uses another word to express immediate consequence, זְמַנָּא. This word also has the sense of an appointed moment and expresses not only the response of the officials to the music but also the reaction of 'the Chaldean men' (v 8, גְּבוּרֵין כַּשְׂדָּאִין) to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego's non-compliance. The use of כָּל-קַבְלָא דְנָה at the beginning of vv 7 and 8 links the response of both the officials and the Chaldeans as the subject of parody.<sup>34</sup> On the next two occasions that immediate action is called for (v 15), the speaker is the king. In an echo of the message previously stated by his herald, the speaker reverts to the time words

---

<sup>29</sup> Avalos, 585

<sup>30</sup> Alter, 106, also recognizes 'the mechanical in human affairs' as 'a primary source of comedy' in biblical narrative. His point is made with the story of Balaam's ass in Num 22.

<sup>31</sup> Good, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy', 52, cites Frye's concept of 'unincremental repetition'.

<sup>32</sup> But contrast Coxon, 'The "List" Genre', 107, who sees no irony, but rather an expression of 'the writer's sense of immanent cosmic order despite the turbulence and chaos of the contemporary scene'.

<sup>33</sup> Avalos, 585

<sup>34</sup> But note that Goldingay, *Daniel*, 66, believes on the grounds of 'poor sense' that the second occurrence arises from dittography. In this he concurs with BHS.

already used by that herald, עֲדָנָא and שְׁעָתָא. This differentiation, as well as emphasizing the mindless response to an order given, distinguishes the narrator from his speakers. The similarity in vocabulary of the official speeches heightens the irony.

The Septuagint is not so consistent in its use of time vocabulary. The references in vv 7f echo those of the Masoretic Text with the use of ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνον. However the other four occurrences are all much less emphatic expressions. Verse 6 does not contain any temporal particle at all. Verse 5 uses ὅταν while v 15 has ἄμα and αὐθιγὰ. A consequence of this is that the parody is not reinforced in the same way, and temporal expressions are not used as part of the distinction between the narrator and his speakers. The abbreviated lists also mean that a satirical edge is not present to the same extent as in MT. The effect on the ear of repeated lists should not be underestimated as part of this process, and that effect is simply not present in G.<sup>35</sup> The point of view of the G narrator is conveyed instead by the greater editorial involvement already noted in the story.

### repetition of phrases

The MT liking for repeated sounds is also seen in the repetition of formulae, often in tripartite phrases. As elsewhere in Daniel (5.7 and 11 for example), there are several obvious examples in this chapter.<sup>36</sup> Of the 22 occasions on which the Jewish heroes feature in the narrative, 13 indicate them by naming all three (שְׁדֵרְךָ מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְעַבְדִּי וְגו'). One is never mentioned without the other two, and they appear in exactly the same order and with the ו in the same place each time. The impression of a formula is heightened when the names occur as direct or indirect object or with a possessive sense. On each of these seven occasions the grammatical indicators are organically connected only to the first name in the list. This is not only true for the preposition ל (vv 13, 20, 22 and 30), but also for עַל (v 19) and דִּי (vv 28f) each of which is connected to the first element by a maqqeph. This feature is also

---

<sup>35</sup>Coxon, 'The "List" Genre', 107

<sup>36</sup>Coxon, 'The "List" Genre', 106

illustrated in the list of officials (v 2, **לְאִשְׁדֵּרְפִּינִי**), and on other occasions in Aramaic Daniel when the mantic officials appear (for example 5.7, **לְאִשְׁפִּינִי**). Another tripartite phrase which is used with the same sort of precision is 'peoples, nations and tongues' (vv 4, 7 and 29, **עַמִּינִי אֲמִינִי וּלְשׁוֹנִי**). Even when each item in the series is in the singular (v 29), the shape of the formula is not disturbed.

In the nature of the languages, the connection of grammatical indicators to the lead item in a list is a feature of Aramaic that is not able to be reproduced by the Greek except in the most rigidly literal translations. The Septuagint uses the names of the young Jews in a similar way to MT and represents most occurrences of the list of names in MT. Apart from the detail that there is never a *καὶ* in the series, the three are always named together and in the same order. Against the Masoretic Text they do not appear by name in vv 19, 23 and 26/93. The difference in v 23 may be accounted for by the tradition behind the Additions which uses the Hebrew names. In v 26/93 the propensity of *Θ* to reduce repetition is a probable explanation, as the list has already occurred once in each verse.

The situation is less clear-cut with the other Aramaic tripartite phrase as represented by *Θ*. The herald addresses 'nations and regions, peoples and tongues' (v 4, *ἔθνη καὶ χῶραι λαοὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι*) where Theodotion represents MT exactly apart from the absence of a *καὶ*. Later the narrator refers to 'all the nations, tribes and tongues' (v 7, *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη φυλαὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι*) and on that occasion the phrasing is a replica of the Aramaic including even the *πᾶς*. However v 96 is different again. Nebuchadnezzar's declaration is applied to 'every nation and all tribes and all tongues' (*πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ πᾶσαι φυλαὶ καὶ πᾶσαι γλῶσσαι*), so the formula is fragmented by the insertion of a qualifying *πᾶς* before each item. This becomes another example of the less formulaic nature of the Septuagintal Greek.

There are a number of other repeated phrases which serve to emphasize a particular point in the story. The 'image' is usually described as that 'which King Nebuchadnezzar set up' (v 2, **דִּי הָקִים נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מַלְכָּא**). That exact wording is used again in vv 3 and 7. On other occasions, such as when the king is being addressed directly or

is himself speaking, there are variations but the verb **קם** is always present (vv 3, 14 and 18). In the process the human origins of the statue are hammered home and the repetition of this has an ironic effect. The 'furnace of blazing fire' (v 11, **אתון נורא יקרהא**) is repeated again and again as if it were a technical term (vv 15, 17, 20, 23 and 26).<sup>37</sup> Often the expression is attached by a maqqeph to 'in the midst of' (**לגוא**). Unlike the above examples, though, it is a formula that is subject to change. In v 19 'the furnace' (**אתונה**) occurs on its own, and vv 24f only uses **נורא**.

The ironic emphasis of the descriptive phrase 'which King Nebuchadnezzar set up' is not nearly as prominent in the Septuagint. The Masoretic Text's opening sentence sets the tone: 'King Nebuchadnezzar made an image' (v 1, **ונוכדנצר מלכא עבר צלם**). There follows a description of its dimensions and the statement that 'he set it up' (**אקימה**). The Septuagint includes the same material, but the effect is more diffuse as it is intertwined with the date and summary of the king's achievements. Verses 2, 14 and 18 are identical to Aramaic in their use of the descriptive phrase. However there is no description of the 'image' (**εἰκόνοϛ**) at all in v 3, again with less emphatic results. The term 'furnace of blazing fire' receives similar treatment in **Θ** and MT, where there is the same variation not in vocabulary but in the number of key words used each time. The Greek consistently uses the phrase **τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην** (vv 11, 15, 20 and 93) or a shortened form (vv 17 and 21). However in the problematical v 23, with its divergent tradition, the term **ἐνεπύρισε** is introduced. This relates to issues surrounding the insertion of the Greek Additions explored earlier.

Of a slightly different order, each time the defiance of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego is spoken of (vv 12, 14, 18 and 28/95) the two verbs **פלח** and **סגר** are used in tandem. They would not 'serve' other gods nor 'worship' the image set up by the king. That these words are heard in the mouths of the Chaldean plotters, the king, and the heroes themselves, highlights the exact nature of the choice being put before the three as well as clarifying the particular cultic use being made of

---

<sup>37</sup>Baldwin, 103



פָּלַח in the present context. The terms 'serve' (λατρεύω) and 'worship' (προσκυνέω) also form a pair in the same verses in 5. This is an exception to the overall picture of MT as a version that uses repetition consistently to underline important points and signpost the perspective of the storyteller, and of the Septuagint as a version that achieves this end by more overt means.

### setting of the story

A number of the characteristics of the respective narratives so far highlighted also combine to give the stories slightly different settings. The Nebuchadnezzar of the Masoretic Text is a Babylonian figure who must be confronted by Jews of the Babylonian diaspora. He sets up a statue of some sort on the plain of Dura 'in the province of Babylon' (v 1, בְּמִדְיַת בָּבֶל). It is unclear exactly where or what 'the plain of Dura' (v 1, בִּקְעַת דּוּרָא) was. Theodotion does not provide us with any clues as he simply transliterates the word. Cook makes a convincing case that the noun דִּוָּר should be taken to mean 'wall', and the large open area between the outer ramparts of the city and its inner wall, 'the plain of the wall', is where the scene took place.<sup>38</sup> Such could well be the understanding lying behind 5's choice of περιβόλου in the phrase 'around the region of Babylon' (v 1, τοῦ περιβόλου χώρας βαβυλωνίας).<sup>39</sup> This places the MT story in a definite local setting. The summarizing phrase at the end of the officials list, 'all the high officials of the province' (vv 2f, כָּל שְׂלֵשֵׁי מְדִינָתָא), denotes by the recurrence of מְדִינָתָא that the preceding list relates also to this particular place.

The point of conflict when it arrives is also expressed in local terms. The slanderous informers are Chaldeans (v 8). They tell the king about 'men of Judah' (v 12, גְּבָרִין יְהוּדָאִין) who are supposed to be in 'the service of the province of Babylon' (v 12, עֲבִידֵי מְדִינַת בָּבֶל), which puts the tension of being Jewish and being in the pay of the Babylonian king

<sup>38</sup>Cook, 116. This point had also earlier been made by Montgomery, *Daniel*, 197.

<sup>39</sup>McCrystall, 74f, sees in the use of περίβολος by 5 a deliberate etymological rendering.

in a nutshell. The rehabilitation of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego when it comes is also expressed in terms of their position 'in the province of Babylon' (v 30/97).

Moreover the salutation of the herald, 'O peoples, nations and tongues' (v 4, **עַמְמֵיָא אַמְיָא וְלִשְׁנֵיָא**), does not include the hyperbolic **כָּל** almost always included with this phrase (3.31 and 6.26 for example). The result is that here the formula is subsumed under the categories previously mentioned in the list of officials. It functions more as another way of describing the diverse group assembled before the king and less as the catch-all expression of universal sovereignty that we see in other contexts. With that in mind, the order from the king at v 29 to 'any people, nation and tongue who...' (**כָּל-עַם אַמְהָ וְלִשָּׁן דִּי-**) is to be understood as the group assembled earlier in the chapter. It is true that the formula **כָּל עַמְמֵיָא אַמְיָא וְלִשְׁנֵיָא** appears in v 7, apparently in contradiction of the point being made above. However by this stage in the narrative the repeated use of the list of imperial functionaries ensures that this all-embracing formula is given a more particular content.

The setting of the Septuagint story is somewhat different. The first group mentioned by ⑤ is 'all those inhabiting the earth' (v 1, πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) from India to Ethiopia. King Nebuchadnezzar, ruler of 'the whole inhabited world' (v 2, τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης) does not call together a large group of officials but 'all the peoples and tribes and tongues' (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ φυλὰς καὶ γλώσσας). Only then does the list of dignitaries come into the account. They become a representative group of the universal reign of Babylon, and it is in that light that the address of the herald is understood. The herald in MT (v 4) addresses the same comprehensive group, but the structure of the narrative is such that the expression is understood in terms of the more limited reality of the province of Babylon.

This argument is dependent to some extent on the meaning of the words **χώρα** and **מְדִינָה** ('province' or 'region' or 'city') as they are understood in this chapter, and the point merits some discussion. The Greek word is considerably more common than the Hebrew / Aramaic. The former often also translates **מָקוֹם** or **אֶרֶץ**, and occasionally **אֶמְלָה**. When

used to represent מדינה it can either refer in general terms to the countryside or environs or to a specific administrative unit. The more specific usage is most prevalent where a Persian provenance is possible as in 2 Esdras (5.8 and 7.16, for example) or Esther (2.3 and 3.12f, for example). We have already noted a differentiation in Daniel 5 and 6 between governing officials of the outlying provincial units (מדינה) and the central court officials. This distinction is explicitly stated in 2.49. Most of the time in the Aramaic of Daniel 3 the Persian sense seems to be intended of Babylon as a province within the empire.<sup>40</sup> Hence the 'high officials of the province' (vv 2 etc, שלטני מדינתא) can be seen as a group of centralized officials distinct from earlier leaders in the list. The phrase is more than simply a summary of the preceding functionaries.

If the Septuagint understands χώρα in the same sense, the argument for a more universalized story in 5 is weakened. The usage in v 2 is identical to the Aramaic (τοὺς ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν κατὰ χώραν) and implies a specific province. The same can be said of its first appearance in v 1. This is also the probable meaning in most of the translations of מדינה in the Persian settings indicated above. Yet in v 4 the term has become part of the general phrase 'nations and regions, peoples and tongues' (ἔθνη καὶ χῶραι λαοὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι). Moreover the second usage in v 1, although in the singular, is confused by its attachment to τοῦ περιβόλου. Perhaps this reflects the 'plain of the wall' idea mentioned earlier, or else introduces yet another sense of χώρα, 'city'. In neither case does it seem to carry a technical sense. On balance, the same uncertainty about administrative terminology may be seen here as elsewhere noted in the Old Greek, and the Septuagint's use of χώρα in the present chapter is not consistent enough to deny the notion of Nebuchadnezzar's universal sovereignty being portrayed.

The repetition in v 2 of οἰκουμένην after the list of officials emphasizes that point. The word occurs frequently in the Psalms and Isaiah, no less than 15 and 12 times respectively. It usually translates

---

<sup>40</sup>Sherriffs, 32, argues that Babylonian nationalism was centred on the city. Perhaps, then, the distinction between province and city was a later Persian understanding.

the Hebrew noun תבל, but also on occasions ארץ. In the Psalms תבל / οἰκούμενη is often in parallel with ארץ / γῆ (Ps 19.5, 24.1 and 33.8, for example) or עמים / λαός (Ps 9.8). The context is generally an expression of God's universal sovereignty, rather than particular appeals to the God of Israel. The use of οἰκούμενη in the present context, then, has the backing not only of a tradition of worship but also of a universalist referent. This is reinforced by its use in prophetic sayings. Of the occurrences in Isaiah, one of particular interest is Is 14.17. The context is an oracle against Babylon, who desired to become like God (Is 14.13f). An expression of that was that he made 'the world' (תבל / οἰκούμενη) a desert. Another example from the prophetic traditions about Babylon is to be found in Jer 51/28.15, and we have seen in other places the significance of the Jeremiah traditions about Nebuchadnezzar for Daniel. There the Lord declares his power in universal terms. Because the Lord has made 'the world' (תבל / οἰκούμενη) as well as 'the earth' and 'the heavens', the claims of Nebuchadnezzar to the inhabited world (οἰκούμενη) will one day be shattered (Jer 51/28.24ff). The double use of οἰκούμενη by ʕ in v 2 strengthens the notion of universal sovereignty being promoted by Nebuchadnezzar.

The summarizing tendency of the Septuagint also affects the setting of the stories. As Coxon has shown, the list was a feature of Babylonian decrees and this included lists of musical instruments.<sup>41</sup> Such lists of musical instruments are known to have had ritual associations in Akkadian. Apart from their other effects in the narrative outlined above, the lists in MT enhance the Babylonian setting and reinforce the ritual context of the challenge facing Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.<sup>42</sup> The effect of the summaries in ʕ, intentional or not, is to distance the story from its specific ritual setting in Babylon.

#### other literary devices

The Aramaic of Daniel contains two further literary devices that are

---

<sup>41</sup>Coxon, 'The "List Genre"', 103

<sup>42</sup>Coxon, 'The "List" Genre', 102, considers that this is a conscious use of 'the literary *Gattung* of the list' by the MT writer.

part of the narrative effects discussed above. The first is the suggestive use of the word **צלם** in v 19 where in Nebuchadnezzar's anger 'the image of his face was changed' (**צלם אפיה אשתנו**).<sup>43</sup> This word in Biblical Hebrew has a primary sense of some sort of physical representation, either of humans (Ez 23.14) or of false gods (2 Ki 11.18 and Ez 7.20). Even when Seth is described as 'according to his (Adam's) image' (Gen 5.3, **כצלמו**), the fact that the phrase is in apposition with 'in his likeness' (**בדמותו**) suggests that physical likeness is intended. There are two obscure references in the Psalms (39.7 and 73.20) which seem to intend a shadow of the whole human person. It is not certain whether the phrase **צלם אלהים** (Gen 1.27, 'image of God') extends beyond the physical likeness of God. What is clear is that nowhere does **צלם** have the particular facial referent of v 19. Even elsewhere in Daniel its use is always in connection with idols or statues (2.31ff). The expected Aramaic word would have been **זיו**, which occurs commonly enough elsewhere in Daniel (4.33; 5.6 and 9f; 7.15).

The result of this unexpected usage is a link between Nebuchadnezzar and the image that he set up. Without suggesting that the image is necessarily in his likeness or that he is claiming divinity, the thought is sown by the narrator that the king himself is the one they are really being asked to fall and worship. Perhaps at the same time he will turn out to be as powerless as the statue of ch 2 that is smashed by the rock quarried out of the mountain but not with human hands. Darius learned a similar lesson. The Septuagint recognizes this unique usage with **μορφή** (v 19), a word that is used elsewhere to translate other words that more definitely mean 'face' or 'visage' (Jud 8.18, Jb 4.16, Is 44.13). However 5 does not proceed to draw a direct verbal link between the king and his statue because the statue, **צלם**, is always called **εἰκών**.

There is another play on words in v 7 that is peculiar to the Aramaic. When 'all' (**כל**) the people hear 'all' (**כל**) kinds of music, 'all' (**כל**) the people fall and worship. The emphasis of this repetition is reinforced by the sound associations in the idiom **כל קבל רנה** at the beginning of the verse, as well as by the homonym **קל** ('sound'). This

---

<sup>43</sup>Fewell, 76

strengthens the parody on the mechanistic response of the gathered worshippers. While the Septuagint also has 'all' three times, it is not able to represent the beginning phrase of MT or the play on words with קל.

### theological differences

The above note about the cultic setting of the story leads us into a consideration of the theological or polemical differences between MT and G. These differences are not so marked as in ch 4-6, but the same emphasis is suggested by them as in those chapters. Just as our discussion of narrative shape was tied to a consideration of the effect of the Additions on narrative flow, so the present discussion relates to what has already been noted about the concerns of the Additions.

As good a place as any to begin is at the famous textual crux in v 17. The problem, centred on the difficult Aramaic phrase, הן איתי אלהנא די-אנתנא פלחין יכל, has a double focus. Semantically the possible meanings of הן and איתי are at issue, and syntactically the separation of יכל from איתי is a problem. This phrase can be understood as, 'If there is a God whom we serve, he is able...' or 'If the God whom we serve is able...'.<sup>44</sup> Either the existence or the competence of God is at stake. Various attempts have been made to skirt round the apparent theological problem inherent in the grammatical problem. Charles resorts to textual emendation to get a text which reads די איתי.<sup>45</sup> Less subjective solutions have included placing איתי with הן and reading the emphatic 'if it be so', or taking the participle יכל together with the copula איתי as a single construction giving 'if our God is able'.<sup>46</sup> The problem with the latter solution is that there is seldom that sort of separation of participle from copula and the copula normally has a suffix

---

<sup>44</sup>Few would disagree with Montgomery, *Daniel*, 206, that הן can only be translated 'if'.

<sup>45</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 69, claims to follow the Versions in so doing.

<sup>46</sup>See Torrey, 'Notes', 241, for 'if it be so...'. See Porteous, 59, Delcor, *Daniel*, 94, and Wharton, 173, for 'if he is able...'.



attached.<sup>47</sup> The problem with understanding *הֵן אֵלֵּי* as 'if it be so' is that it strains the natural sense of the phrase. Coxon has shown that *אֵלֵּי* denotes existence in Biblical Aramaic on two-thirds of its 15 occurrences in Daniel (as for example at 2.28, 3.29 and 5.11).<sup>48</sup> Yet his own argument that *הֵן אֵלֵּי* bears an emphatic sense contradicts that evidence, and is dependent on unusual usages both of the Aramaic and of the Akkadian cognate *basu* ('to be, exist') that he summons in support of the suggestion.<sup>49</sup> It becomes a syntactical argument addressed to a theological problem and as such is not finally compelling.

The most convincing interpretation of MT 3.17a is still the plainest, 'if our God exists...'. But such an interpretation raises questions of sense when vv 17 and 18 are considered together. Firstly, it is strange that the young men express doubt in the existence of a God described as the one 'whom we serve' (*דִּי-אַתְנָא פִּלְחִין*), a phrase which does not appear to admit of the possibility of non-existence. Secondly, the logic of their reply is such that God's deliverance of his followers becomes a necessary consequence of his existence (v 17). It is not possible to determine from ch 3 whether or not a certainty of rescue partly motivates their faithfulness, but it seems unlikely. After all, in the companion story of ch 6 Daniel clearly acts in defiance of the king's command because that is the right thing to do, and the only one in the story who expresses any hope of rescue from the lions for him is Darius. Thirdly, if the *הֵן* in v 17 applies to the existence of God, the *הֵן לֹא* of v 18 must apply to the consequence of his non-existence. It seems strange that Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego's defiance is founded solely on a desire to thwart the king, when there is no indication either here or in ch 6 that the Jewish courtiers are anything other than committed to their service as officials of the king. In short, there is an impasse when meaning and syntax confront each other.

---

<sup>47</sup>The unusual argument of Wesseliuss, 206, that v 16 is the apodosis of v 17 is of the same type, but fails because it does not treat *אֵלֵּי* adequately.

<sup>48</sup>Coxon, 'Daniel III 17', 407

<sup>49</sup>Coxon, 'Daniel III 17', 406

The best way out of this impasse is to accept the text as it is without assuming the presence of exceptional syntax, and at the same time to take the prevailing direction of thought in vv 17f in the context of the thinking of chs 3 and 6. In that case אִי is most likely to denote existence, as Coxon has demonstrated, but the precursor of וְהָיָה לָא (v 18) is most likely to be שִׁיזָב rather than אִי. Hence the young men are expressing their determination in the face of God's potential inactivity, not his inability.<sup>50</sup> Montgomery's objection that to doubt God's willingness is to doubt his ability flies in the face of much Old Testament thinking where God is upbraided for his inactivity.<sup>51</sup> It would seem then that the first part of v 17 represents an *ad hominem* argument by Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego without them considering for a moment the possibility of God's non-existence. The rest of the speech is based on the assumption that God is there and on the common enough attitude that loyalty to him is not dependent on whether or not he acts on their behalf.

Translations from antiquity onwards have struggled with the ambiguity of this text that is arguing two different things at once. Theodotion interprets the beginning of v 17 by omitting entirely the 'if...' section while preserving the 'if not..' of v 18. The result is a simple affirmation that 'there is a God' (v 17, ἔστιν γὰρ θεός). The thought behind the Septuagint is even more different from MT in several ways. The speech of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego becomes a confession of faith and the basic 'if...if not' sense progression of MT is not present. The question of existence, absent in θ but present in MT, is still there but without the 'if'. Instead θ affirms that 'there is (a) God in the heavens' (ἔστι γὰρ θεὸς ἐν οὐρανοῖς). Moreover there is only 'one' (εἷς) such God who is also described confessionally as 'our Lord' (κύριος ἡμῶν). The Septuagint also asserts that he is able to rescue, so there is no shadow of doubt either that God is or that God is able.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup>This was the interpretation of Jephth, 17, who says v 18 means 'if he should not deliver us; for he will not leave us in thy hand out of inability'. See also Ibn-Ezra in Gallé, 35.

<sup>51</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 206. See for example Psalm 88 where the existence of God is never in doubt.

<sup>52</sup>In a similar way the 'secularity' of the Esther story in MT contrasts

Without the heroes saying explicitly that he would rescue them, their phrase 'And then it will be plain to you' (v 18, καὶ τότε φανερόν σοι ἔσται) suggests that his doing so will be a vindication of their stand.

As a literary aside, although the Greek of v 17 reflects the word order of the Aramaic, the result is a felicitously balanced sentence that focuses the issues of the story quite sharply. After the first phrase, whose problems we have examined, the heroes express confidence in a God who is able 'to rescue us out of the furnace of fire and out of your hand, O King, he will rescue us' (ἐξελέσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς καμίνου τοῦ πυρός καὶ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, βασιλεῦ, ἐξελεῖται ἡμᾶς). The juxtaposition of the furnace with the hand of the king and the bracketing of both by the verb ἐξαιρέω, reinforce the point that the issue centres on the person of the king. In rescuing them from the furnace God rescues them from the hand of Nebuchadnezzar who thought there was no god able to do so (v 15).

This interpretative translation on the part of ⑤ demonstrates once again the version's monotheistic emphasis and its concern to promote the cause of the God of Israel. The inclusion of the word κύριος at vv 28/95f is typical of the Septuagint and reinforces the uniqueness rather than the primacy of God. The expression 'Most High God of gods' (v 26/93, τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ ὑψίστου) in Rahlfs cannot be taken as an exception to that trend as P967 does not include τῶν θεῶν. This theme is made explicit by the Additional declaration at v 45 that 'you alone are the Lord God...' (σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος ὁ θεός).<sup>53</sup> Κύριος occurs as a *Leitwort* in the prayer and song. The universal sovereignty of the God of Israel in particular, as emphasized here by ⑤, is a theme noted in the other Septuagint chapters studied so far.

Here as elsewhere the theme of sovereignty is closely related to that of idolatry. The difference between the versions is not as marked because the theme of the 'image' (צלם) is already central to the Aramaic story. Nevertheless the Septuagintal concern over idolatry is hinted at

---

with the A-text, which brings God much more into the foreground. See the discussion in Fox, 129ff.

<sup>53</sup> Daubney, 63

again in vv 12 and 18 when the three young men refuse to worship the king's 'idols' (εἰδωλον) instead of his 'gods' as in the Masoretic Text. It is difficult to say whether the question of the divinization of kings lurks behind the Septuagint of ch 3, as it undoubtedly does in ch 6.<sup>54</sup> It is a matter for debate whether or not the statue was the representation of a figure or not, and if it was, whether that figure was the king or one of his gods.<sup>55</sup> Hippolytus connects the figure with the head of gold in the preceding chapter.<sup>56</sup> Even so, that does not require a representation of Nebuchadnezzar himself and the contents of MT vv 12-14 render it unlikely. The Septuagint at v 12 hints at the possibility that the idol was of the king himself with 'your idol they did not serve, and your golden image...they did not worship' (τῷ εἰδώλῳ σου οὐκ ἐλάτρευσαν καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι σου τῇ χρυσεῇ...οὐ προσεκύνησαν). But the evidence is tenuous and hangs on the extra σου, so too much cannot be made of the issue in this particular chapter.<sup>57</sup>

Another difference in outlook is possibly present in the Septuagint's use of φοβέω in v 17, a matter that has been touched on above. Out of the several hundred uses of φοβέω in the Septuagint most are a translation of נָחַד, so the Greek word normally shows the same breadth of semantic range. It is not used elsewhere to translate either עָבַד or פָּלַח. A broad generalization could be made that the word does not often occur in a cultic setting, and expresses fear either of God or man. A comparison of the usage of φοβέω may be brought a little closer to the present context if we look at its occurrences in apocryphal Greek books, particularly Sirach and Maccabees. We find 29 uses in Sirach, only one of which has a cultic referent (Sir 7.31). It is overwhelmingly used as a wisdom term to describe an attitude of heart and mind toward God

---

<sup>54</sup>But compare Delcor, 'Un cas de traduction "Targumique"', 33.

<sup>55</sup>See for example Delcor, *Daniel*, 91f, Goldingay, *Daniel*, 69, and Montgomery, *Daniel*, 195.

<sup>56</sup>Hippolytus, 469

<sup>57</sup>Pritchard, *Pictures*, pl 537, depicts 'a procession of gods mounted on animals, between two figures of the Assyrian king'. Some of the gods bear a remarkable resemblance to the king, suggesting that identification of the king with the gods does not require a direct representation of him in the statue. See Roth, 29.

encapsulated in Sir 1.14 and 15.1. Only in Sir 26.5 does φοβέω speak of the fear of man. By contrast the books of the Maccabees use the word mostly in terms of the fear of human enemies. Despite the Maccabean concern for the desecration of the temple, the word is not used in those books in connection with cultic worship. To continue the comparison with two prophets, Isaiah seems representative of the rest of the Old Testament in using φοβέω indifferently with God or man as its object. Of the 22 uses in Septuagintal Jeremiah, the same can be said. The expression 'another heart to fear me' (καρδίαν ἑτέραν φοβηθῆναί με) in Jer 32/39.39 reflects the same sort of usage as in Sirach. The only time when 'fearing the Lord' has a possible cultic significance is at Jer 3.8, where the setting is a condemnation of involvement in the fertility cult.

Against this, as we saw in the context of Darius' confession (6.27f), λατρεύω is a word that probably has connotations of service in worship and as such reflects a portion of the semantic range of the Aramaic פִּלַּח.<sup>58</sup> In fact by the time of Official Aramaic, and on into Middle and Late Aramaic, although there is still considerable crossover between the meanings of the two words, פִּלַּח is more likely than עִבֵּר to be used in a worship context.<sup>59</sup> Typical of the Biblical Aramaic usage of עִבֵּר is 5.1 where Belshazzar 'makes' a feast, 6.28 where God 'does' signs and wonders, or Ezra 6.12 where Darius commands a decree to be 'carried out'. In short almost all the vocabulary indicators of both the Aramaic and Greek in v 17 (פִּלַּח and λατρεύω) suggest a cultic context and raise the question of whether or not any significance may be detected in the unexpected use of φοβέω by the Septuagint at this point.

It could be simply an attempt at variety on the part of a translator who did not make such distinctions.<sup>60</sup> Another possibility is that the

---

<sup>58</sup>Coxon, 'Daniel III 17', 403

<sup>59</sup>See the chronology of Aramaic outlined by Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel*, 17. Coxon, 'Daniel III 17', 403, with Ibn Ezra does not consider the possibility of historical development.

<sup>60</sup>I am conscious of the caution from Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language*, 120, for care to be taken in etymological matters. In this instance, however, there does seem to be evidence of historical development of meaning in the directions I have indicated.

creator of the Septuagint version is hinting at the fact that the question of cultic service is part of the much wider question, 'whom shall we fear?'. In its attempt to understand the Aramaic idiom **שׁוּט...שׁוּט** in v 12, **Θ** has already hinted at this sort of understanding with 'did not fear your commandment' (οὐκ ἐφοβήθησάν σου τὴν ἐντολήν). This is consistent with the less mantic view of wisdom that the Septuagint also demonstrates in chs 4-6 by its concern to distance Daniel from other wisdom officials.

### narrative links with Daniel 4-6

A discussion of the links between this and other chapters in Daniel is necessarily incomplete, as was the case after ch 6, as there are a number of points of contact between chs 3 and 2. These will feature as part of the work on ch 2. It is, however, now possible to return to the analysis begun in the context of Daniel 6 where the closeness of the relationship between chs 3 and 6 was noted. There are also some features in common with chs 4 and 5. Some of these have been touched on in the course of the foregoing discussion, but others warrant more detailed treatment. Several aspects of narrative technique show the same differences between the versions as can be detected in the previous chapters treated. The omniscience of the **Θ** narrator is more editorial and that of MT more neutral. The Septuagint signposts perspective in more overt ways such as his anticipation of events in the story, whereas the Masoretic Text relies on the story and the words of the characters.

In particular, in MT chs 3 and 6 the heroes remain largely silent throughout their ordeal.<sup>61</sup> Before being thrown into the furnace Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego assert that their God can save them and they are determined to follow him. After being lifted out of the lion pit Daniel says that his God has delivered him. In neither case do the Jews condemn the king for his actions nor do they use the events as a vindication of themselves or their God. Each time the king himself recognizes and

---

<sup>61</sup>Bickerman, 81 and 89, thinks of their casting into the fire as an 'ordeal' in the judicial sense. If both the fire and the lions' pit are ordeals, the ordeal procedure serves as a further narrative link between chs 3 and 6.



speaks that vindication. On both occasions the Septuagint portrays its point of view by placing an explicit condemnation of the sovereign in the mouths of the heroes.

As was particularly the case in ch 6, MT is reliant on the reader picking up the irony inherent in the story to deduce the point of view of the narrator himself. For the various reasons noted this is not so prominent a feature of  $\mathfrak{G}$ . On the subject of irony, though, it should be noted that there is a different type of comedic effect at work in the Masoretic Text than was the case in ch 6. There, the effect was achieved through what we called the irony of ignorance. Here the effect is achieved primarily through incremental repetition. In both cases the Septuagint narrative does not contain the same degree of irony, not through any deliberate policy on the part of the translator but by the natural outworking of some aspect of his technique. In ch 6 this comes about because of the more overt narratorial stance whereas in ch 3 it is a result of the summarizing tendencies of  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

Despite the differences in genre, a number of similarities between the opening verses of chs 3 and 5 in the Masoretic Text have been noted.<sup>62</sup> The dating of ch 3 by the Septuagint and its inclusion of other plus material in the first verse means that this parallelism is not as marked in the Septuagint.

#### literary links with Daniel 4-6

The relationship between chs 3 and 6 in MT can also be demonstrated in literary terms.<sup>63</sup> There is the same play on the theme of the 'law' (vv 10 and 29,  $\text{שעם}$ ). The uses of  $\text{שיזב}$  ('deliver', 3.15, 17 and 28; 6.15, 21 and 28),  $\text{שלו}$  ('blasphemy' or 'incompetence', 3.29 and 6.5), and  $\text{צלח}$  ('to succeed', 3.30 and 6.29), are all particular in Daniel to these two chapters.<sup>64</sup>  $\text{בהתבהלה}$  ('in trepidation', 3.24 and 6.20) is also an unusual

---

<sup>62</sup>See Fewell, 114f, for a detailed exposition of this narrative parallelism.

<sup>63</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 126

<sup>64</sup>See BHS on the ketiv / qere variants of  $\text{שלו}$  in 3.29. Most accept the

expression in both although it also appears at 2.25. There are two idiomatic expressions that are shared by chs 3 and 6. The heroes' opponents 'eat pieces of' (3.8 and 6.25, **אכל קדציהן**) their Jewish counterparts in both chapters. The idiom 'to take notice of' (3.12 and 6.14, **שים שנים על**) is also a common feature.<sup>65</sup>

The Septuagint represents **שיזב** with either ἐξέρχομαι or σώζω. Ἐξέρχομαι is also used to translate **נפק** (5.5). **שלו** is translated differently on each occasion, once with βλάβη (3.29/96) and once with ἄγνοια (6.5). The latter word also appears in ch 4 (v 34) and is used at 6.23 to represent **חבלה** ('harm'). It is uncertain what the exact equivalent of the ch 3 occurrence of **צלח** is, but it is translated with καθίστημι in ch 6. Again this is a word in common use elsewhere in Daniel, translating variously **קם** (2.21 and 6.2), **נצה** (2.24 and 49), and **שלט** (2.48). The expression **בהתחלה** is unrepresented in the Greek on both occasions while **שנים...שנים** is unrepresented once and interpreted as 'fear' at 3.12. The Septuagint gives a straightforward non-idiomatic translation of **אכל קדציהן** each time, but not the same one. 3.8 has διαβάλλω while 6.25 has καταμαρτύρω. This variety of translation is a further indication that the pairing of chs 3 and 6 that seems likely in the Masoretic Text is not a feature of the Septuagintal version of these two stories. Exceptionally, the Septuagint draws a link between the fire of ch 3 and the lions of ch 6 in that neither 'troubled' (3.50, παρηνώχλησεν, and 6.19, παρηνώχλησαν) those who were subjected to their rigours. Neither reference is represented in MT.

#### thematic links with Daniel 4-6

Chs 4-6 in the Septuagint all displayed a greater polemic against idolatry than their MT counterparts. Because a major theme of the Aramaic story of ch 3 is already idolatry there is not the same marked thematic variation. But allied to this is a concern in ⑥ to assert the

---

qere reading, but see Paul, 292f, who prefers the ketiv. His accompanying attempt to read **שלח** in 6.5 is not convincing.

<sup>65</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 88, has a comprehensive list of the similarities in vocabulary between chs 3 and 6.

uniqueness of God and to rediscover the purity of an Israelite cult corrupted by an evil monarch because of the sins of the chosen people. The more monotheist outlook of ̣ is a feature of all the chapters studied so far, while the sins of the people and the desecration of the cult appears in ̣ ch 4. The Additions bring out these concerns strongly and they are reinforced by small differences between the versions in the main part of the chapter.

This chapter raises problems for anybody seeking to find a development in Jewish angelology between the two versions. A feature of ch 6 was the difference in agency in the lion pit. The Septuagint attributes Daniel's deliverance to the direct intervention of God whereas MT says God sent an angel to close the lions' mouths. In contrast, ̣ ch 3 features an angel as the agent of salvation in the furnace. The Masoretic Text remains ambiguous about the fourth figure in the fire, but the Additions dispel the ambiguity and enter into some physical detail about the angel's work (3.49f and 25/92).<sup>66</sup> Both versions of ch 4 speak of the work of a heavenly being. So it looks as though there is no consistent evidence pointing to different views on angels between versions. What can be said is that the Septuagint tends to be more specific about their activities while the Masoretic Text surrounds them with an air of mystery.

#### Septuagint links with Daniel 4

The dating of the story by the Septuagint creates a significant link not present in MT. There is no date on the story of the fiery furnace in MT but ̣ puts it in the 'eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar the king'. This is the same date given to ch 4 which is also undated in the Masoretic Text, and seems like a conscious attempt by the Septuagint to link both stories with each other and with the events described in Jer 52.<sup>67</sup> They concern the attack on the sovereignty of Israel and the

---

<sup>66</sup>Saadia, in Gallé, 38f, interprets **בֶּרֶךְ-אֱלֹהִים** as **מַלְאָךְ** ('angel'). He identifies the angel who cools the furnace as Gabriel. See the discussion of Brock, 'To Revise or Not to Revise', 318f, and Walters, 254f, on the rendering of **בְּנֵי-הָאֱלֹהִים** in Gen 6.2.

<sup>67</sup>Porteous, 60. Others suggest a further tie-up with Jeremiah in the

integrity of Jerusalem and the temple cult. Those are the same concerns, but from a different era, that the Septuagint is worried about. This does not contradict the earlier observation that the Septuagint setting is more general than the MT setting. Both highlight in different ways the distance of the Septuagint from the setting in the Babylonian or Persian diaspora. The diaspora is concerned with the accommodation of individual Jews to the empire while the second temple concerns of ⑤ are to do with the struggle for survival of the Jewish nation. The dating of chs 3 and 4 highlight the nationalist concerns, while the universalizing of Nebuchadnezzar's sovereignty supports the monotheistic idea that the God of Israel is the God of the nations.

One result of this is that the ⑤ picture of Nebuchadnezzar with respect to the nation of Israel is quite different from the one it draws of Darius in ch 6. We saw that the Septuagint, although condemning Darius, at the same time seems to view him in terms reminiscent of the patriarchs and other heroes of the nation. In ch 3 the Septuagint, by dating the story, consciously sets Nebuchadnezzar as a threat to the nation. Although he ultimately submits in cultic terms to the God of Israel at the end of ch 4, he is never accorded the honours that are implicitly given Darius. This is the opposite of what is happening in the Masoretic Text. Darius' capitulation is only partial and the condemnation of Belshazzar is total. Nebuchadnezzar however is projected in a more favourable light. At least he is no worse than Darius and is considerably better than Belshazzar. He capitulates to the God of the Jews in terms appropriate to the exilic setting, and certainly poses no long term threat to the nation. As we have seen, his portrayal in the MT story is in one sense a development of the theme 'Nebuchadnezzar my servant' (Jer 27/34.6). Such can certainly not be said for the Septuagint, where the more explicit conversion is a vindication of the God and nation of Israel rather than an endorsement of Nebuchadnezzar.

In P967 chs 7 and 8 intervene between 4 and 5 in what many see as the older order.<sup>68</sup> Certainly the effect is to place 3 and 4 as a pair in

---

burning of the prophets described at Jer 29/36.21ff. See Peters, 109.

<sup>68</sup>See again Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte Historisante', 198ff, who

a way that they are not in the Masoretic Text, and their common dating is part of that. The confessional material in ᠙ ch 4 also contains strong echoes of the Song of the Three. Nebuchadnezzar's acknowledgement of the creator of 'heaven and earth and the sea and the rivers and all that are in them' (4.37, τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς) appears to be a summary of vv 59-81. The expression 'God of gods' (4.37, θεὸς τῶν θεῶν) reflects v 90.<sup>69</sup> The king's praise of 'all his holy ones' (4.37a, πάντα τοὺς ἁγίους αὐτοῦ) appears as a reminder of vv 85-87. As a result of the pairing of these two chapters, Nebuchadnezzar's confession in the ᠙ plus material of ch 4 becomes partly a response to what he has seen and heard of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah.

In further support of this suggestion is the king's statement that he is overcome by 'trembling from fear of him (God)' (4.37a, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ τρόμος). This picks up on the unusual usage that we noted of φοβέω by ᠙ in v 17. Just as Nebuchadnezzar is moved in ch 4 to praise the God whom the young men praise in ch 3, so he adopts the same 'fear' of God in ch 4 that they show in ch 3. The pairing of 3 and 4 also explains why the final speech of Nebuchadnezzar in ch 3 is not as confessional as its counterparts in chs 4 and 6. If chs 3 and 4 reflect a process of development in the king, the confession of ch 4 becomes the completion of the partial acknowledgement in ch 3. The corollary of this is that chs 5 and 6 are also a pairing culminating in the same sort of confession by Darius.

### conclusion

The major difference between the two accounts of ch 3 lies in the insertion of Additional material between vv 23 and 24. In narrative terms it shifts the centre of the story away from the moment of defiance described in MT vv 16-18 and on to the contents of the Prayer of Azariah

---

regards this order as original. Lust, 'The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4-5', 8, agrees.

<sup>69</sup>P967 has this reading despite the fact that at v 26/93 it differs from Syh-88 by not having τῶν θεῶν.

and Song of the Three. The divergence of traditions immediately before and after the insertion, as well as the piece of narrative between the prayer and song, results in similar differences between the narrative art of MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  as have been observed in chs 4-6. There are also other smaller differences between MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  in the commonly held material that reinforce the narrative effects of the Additions. The  $\mathfrak{G}$  narrator is more overt and less neutral than his MT counterpart. One result of this is an anticipation of the narrative by  $\mathfrak{G}$  and more explicit guidance to the reader on matters of perspective. The Masoretic Text is more dependent on the inherent development of the story to portray perspective. In this particular instance the perception of irony is crucial to an understanding of MT where such is not the case in the Septuagint. The same was true of ch 6 although the differences came about there by different means. In another parallel with ch 6, the heroes of the fiery furnace maintain a pregnant silence in MT except at the moment of declaring God's faithfulness, and it is left to the king to declare the vindication of their God. In both instances the  $\mathfrak{G}$  has Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego and Daniel explicitly condemn the king. The Septuagint habit seen particularly in ch 4 of explicating the mysterious is also present in ch 3.

The particular concerns of the Additions are borne out by a comparison of the rest of the chapter with MT. The interest in the Jewish nation and the integrity of its major institutions is reinforced by the slightly different setting of the  $\mathfrak{G}$  story which places Nebuchadnezzar in a position of explicit opposition to those institutions. The Masoretic Text account is a more local story of courage in the diaspora. Moreover the emphasis by  $\mathfrak{G}$  on the uniqueness of the God of Israel with its accompanying suspicion of idolatry or the divinization of the monarch are also features of a comparison with MT in Daniel 3. The difference is less marked on the subject of idolatry as that is an explicit concern of the Aramaic version anyway. There is also a hint at the different view of wisdom held by  $\mathfrak{G}$  in other chapters, although the evidence is not conclusive.

It is generally true that the structural and literary links between chs 3 and 6 are much stronger in the Masoretic Text. In the Septuagint a stronger relationship between chs 3 and 4 may be detected.



This is seen first in the paired dating of the chapters by ᠖, which alerts the reader to the part played by Nebuchadnezzar in the destruction of Jewish national life and links him with the evil king of the Additions. It is then noticeable that the royal confession of ch 4 echoes the Song of the Three and completes the partial capitulation of Nebuchadnezzar in ch 3. This pairing of chs 3 and 4 fits in with the P967 ordering of the book of Daniel. By contrast the Masoretic Text displays strong organic links with ch 6 in the way that ch 5 assumed ch 4. One result of this difference is that the positive picture of Nebuchadnezzar displayed in MT chs 4-5 is not present in the Septuagint to the same extent. This pairing does not preclude a relationship with other MT stories and the similarity of the opening with ch 5 was noted. But there is more to be said on the subject once the story of the statue in ch 2 has been examined.

## CHAPTER SIX

### DANIEL 2

Daniel 2 is different from each of the stories so far considered in chs 3-6 in two important respects. Firstly the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text are closer to each other than is the case in 3-6. Secondly, the redaction history of the text of MT is more visible than in the other Aramaic stories about Babylonian or Persian kings. As a result of these differences my approach to the present chapter will diverge from the pattern that has informed our discussion of the other stories. The relative closeness of the two versions to each other means that the literary focus is less on matters of structure and literary craftsmanship and more on questions of content, although the two aspects interconnect. The visibility of the process of redaction means that MT ch 2 does not yield as readily to a narrative critical approach that assumes the literary unity of the story. Before a literary comparison can be made I must therefore deal with the fact that there is more than one level of tradition evident in the Masoretic Text.

The two particular sections that have a bearing on the present discussion are vv 13-23 and vv 40-43. There is evidence of some corruption or emendation of the tradition in vv 40-43. Because they do not have a direct bearing on the narrative criticism of the chapter as a whole, I do not analyze those verses explicitly in source critical terms. However, I note the problems they pose where it is appropriate to do so. Vv 13-23 bear more directly on the ensuing discussion. Accordingly, this treatment begins with a detailed examination of the case both for vv 13-23 being a later insertion and for the song of praise in vv 20-23 being an independent unit. I then proceed to a comparison of MT with *Ḡ* on the basis that material in vv 13-23 is not original to the prototype

of MT, and that vv 20-23 have probably been introduced.

This comparison is made with respect to the narrative structures, the presence or otherwise of irony and ambiguity, and the narrator's stance and manipulation of point of view. Certain literary devices within the versions will also be noted. There are some significant variations in these areas despite the closeness of the versions to each other. In turning from there to the more substantial matters of content, I will compare the interpretation of the dream, and note some evidence for differences in theological outlook. In the process differences are detected in the backdrop to each story and in the way the protagonists, Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar, are portrayed.

In the nature of this approach to Daniel 2, links with other chapters form an integral part of the discussion and so are not treated separately at the end, except as part of the conclusion. There I suggest that the trends evident in chs 3-6 are also present in ch 2, although they have been obscured by the transmission history of MT.

#### **verses 13-23: inserted material?**

Up until now I have worked with the premise, particularly where MT is concerned, that, notwithstanding the historical process of composition discernible behind the stories, each of them functions in their received form as a literary unit. The case of vv 13-23 in Daniel 2 forces an exception to that practice, as the possibility that those verses have been inserted cannot be ignored in a literary discussion of the texts. Accordingly I propose to explore that possibility in the Masoretic Text before turning to the literary comparison of ch 2. I treat vv 13-23 as a whole first and then turn the focus onto Daniel's song of praise within that material (vv 20-23). Although they differ over where exactly the interpolated material begins, most commentators see these verses as a subsequent insertion.<sup>1</sup> Generally they do so in order to solve the problem of Daniel's two audiences with Arioch (vv 15 and 24) and also

---

<sup>1</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 46, and Hartman and DiLella, 139, see the inserted material beginning at v 13. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 46, Porteous, 42, and Heaton, 128, prefer v 14.

with the king (vv 16 and 25f).<sup>2</sup> It seems strange that Daniel needs an introduction by Arioch when he has already been to see the king on his own. Moreover Daniel's ignorance of the king's actions is difficult to explain in the light of v 13 and also of his promotion at the end of ch 1.

In fact the evidence for vv 13-23 having been inserted into the Masoretic Text is indecisive. The above argument as an objection to the literary unity of ch 2 assumes that narrative time always corresponds to real chronological time. While the use of flashback and anticipation in biblical narrative is rare, it is not unheard of and chronological and narrative time should not always be strictly equated.<sup>3</sup> For example the reference in 1.21 to Daniel's service until the days of Cyrus is a narratorial intrusion in that it moves outside the time frame of the story to provide a panoramic introduction to the career of Daniel. If 1.20 is also part of that anticipation, it is not necessary for Daniel to be a prominent figure in the court when the present story opens. Furthermore the doubling of action in itself is not necessarily a marker of secondary material, as we saw in the discussion on 3.23. It can serve a resumptive or anticipatory function, although admittedly it is difficult to see what purpose would be served in this particular instance.<sup>4</sup> The functioning of time within the narrative on its own does not demand the conclusion that vv 13-23 are secondary.

Moreover much the same use of revelation and interpretation terminology may be discerned in this section as in the rest of the chapter. That aspect is explored in more detail in the section on point of view within the narrative. Suffice to say at this stage that when Daniel makes a play for extra time from the king, he offers 'to declare' (v 16, **לְהַגִּיד**) the interpretation to the king. The object of that verb

---

<sup>2</sup>See for example Wills, 82, who follows Hartman and DiLella, 139.

<sup>3</sup>Bar-Efrat, 179

<sup>4</sup>Contrast the reading of Fewell, 52, who integrates vv 13-23 by her interpretation of the function of Arioch in the story. Contrast also Goldingay, *Daniel*, 42, whose opinion that this section heightens suspense is treated below.

is **פֶּשֶׁרָא** just as it usually is elsewhere in ch 2. He uses words appropriate to his function as a human intermediary of wisdom, which would have been how he perceived himself and how he was perceived by Nebuchadnezzar. Yet when the activity of God in revelation is described (vv 19 and 22) the verb **גִּלָּא** is used in the same specialized sense as elsewhere in the chapter. In the first instance the usual object, **רִן** (v 19), is also present.

A comparison of other vocabulary used in these verses likewise fails to yield a consistent pattern in favour of the distinction. There are several words or phrases that are unique to this part of Daniel, namely **עֲטָא וְטַעַם** (v 14, 'wisdom and discretion'), **עַל-מָה** (v 15, 'why?'), and **רַחֵם** (v 18, 'mercy'). But that fact on its own does not function as an argument for a different source. Most of the key words also occur in ch 2 outside vv 13-19. There are a few that do not, but they do not provide a large enough sample from which to draw conclusions. Indeed, the instances in question are normally well represented elsewhere in Daniel 2-7. Examples are **בֵּית** (v 17, 'house', also in 3.29; 4.1 and 27; 5.23; 6.11), **בַּעַה** (v 18, 'seek', also in 4.33; 6.8 and 13; 7.16), **שְׂאֵר** (v 18, 'the rest', also in 7.12 and 19), and **בֵּרַךְ** (v 19, 'blessed', also in 4.31 and 6.11). The one statement that could tentatively be made is that the choice of words in MT vv 13-19 shows some resemblance to ch 7. **שְׂאֵר** above is one example as is the form of the phrase 'vision of the night' (v 19, **חֲזוֹן דִּי-לֵילִיא**, also in 7.2, 7 and 13). Despite that, there is little in the vocabulary used that distinguishes vv 13-19 from the rest of ch 2.

However a more compelling argument for vv 13-23 as an insertion emerges in an examination of the balance between narrative and dialogue in the structure of the chapter. The predominance of direct speech is a notable feature of Daniel 2. There are two verses of narrative at the beginning and end of the story. Excluding the problematical vv 13-23 for the moment, 32 of the remaining 34 verses consist of direct speech or narrative indicators of direct speech. The exceptions are vv 12 and 46. In fact there is more direct speech than in any of the other chapters so far studied. Such is not the case in vv 14-19, however. Daniel asks a direct question of Arioch in v 15 but apart from that all the interchanges between characters are reported indirectly. To begin with, at v 14 there is an unusual form of expression when Daniel is said to

have 'responded with counsel and discretion' (הָחִיב עֲסָא וְשַׁעִם) to Arioch. **חֹב** is a word more specifically connected with the conduct of dialogue than the wide-ranging **עִנָּה**, but is never so used in Daniel except here. The occurrence in 3.16 is a different type of usage. It seems therefore to be more of a descriptive term than a narrative marker and so not in character with the rest of the narrative surrounding these verses. This becomes even more clear in the next few verses. Arioch 'made known' (v 15, הוֹדִיעַ) the state of affairs to Daniel, who thereupon goes in and 'asks of the king' (v 16, בָּעָה מִן־מֶלֶךְ) for more time. Having done that, he goes home and 'made known' (v 17, הוֹדִיעַ) the matter to his companions. Despite all this communication between characters, their words are never reported directly. As a result the action is filtered through the narrator to the reader, who is not permitted the first hand view that direct speech allows.

In terms of narrative structure, then, a case could perhaps be made that the material in vv 13-19 is different in kind from that surrounding it. A consideration of the subject matter of those verses leads in the same direction since the presumption by MT of Daniel's qualifications as a wise man lies entirely within the verses under discussion.<sup>5</sup> Outside that material the Masoretic Text is a pure court contest.<sup>6</sup> The rank outsider, whose only achievement so far has been to graduate with honours from the king's training programme, inquires about the harsh decree and proves himself as a wise man by solving the problem set the wise men by the king. Daniel's petition on behalf of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego at the end of the chapter thereby links back to the events of ch 1 rather than to their role as his confidants in the present story.

In corroboration we note that the only time the Aramaic section calls Daniel's three friends by their Semitic names is in v 17. They are called Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah elsewhere only in the Hebrew ch 1 or in the Additional Greek material of ch 3. This fact may not be grounds

---

<sup>5</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 46. Jepheth, 8, suggests that Daniel does not appear when the Babylonian wise men are first called because he does not see himself in the same category as the Chaldeans.

<sup>6</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 36, notes that the rivalry is not a hostile one.



on its own to identify and draw firm lines between traditions, but it does suggest that this material comes from a different source, albeit one that has a great deal still in common with the material surrounding it.

The main argument against this view is found in vv 36 and 47 where plural forms seem to include Daniel's compatriots in the narrative. In v 36 Daniel tells the king that 'we will tell' (נאמר) his dream and give its interpretation, while in v 47 Nebuchadnezzar uses the plural suffix in 'your God' (אלהיכם).<sup>7</sup> In the canonical context the most obvious referent of the first person plural prefix is Daniel with his three friends. Both Θ and θ take that to be the case with their use of ἐποῦμεν. But this has for long been recognized as an unsatisfactory aspect of the MT narrative.<sup>8</sup> If the point is accepted that vv 13-23 are later additions in the Aramaic the plurals in vv 36 and 47 are inexplicable as meaning the four young Jews, because three of them are not even present. Various explanations have been attempted. The direct approach is to say that the MT rendering is itself a result of amendment to bring it into line with the earlier inclusion of the companions of Daniel. The difficulty with this argument is that the process is curiously incomplete in light of the craftsmanship demonstrated elsewhere in MT, and it is unsupported by any Aramaic textual tradition. The only support comes from several late translations alluded to by Ziegler. In narrative terms, Montgomery summarizes the several commonly offered explanations.<sup>9</sup> The plural could be understood as an expression of deference or humility.<sup>10</sup> It could also be understood along the lines taken by the medieval Jewish commentators as 'I and His Wisdom'.<sup>11</sup> This is similar to the notion of a divine council lying behind the

---

<sup>7</sup>Young, *Daniel*, 81

<sup>8</sup>Ziegler, 108. Ethiopic and Arabic traditions follow the Peshitta in preferring the first person with *dicam*. Similarly Bohairic presents *annuntiabo tibi et dicam*.

<sup>9</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 71f

<sup>10</sup>Delcor, *Daniel*, 179, thinks of it as a 'royal we' by the intermediary.

<sup>11</sup>Ibn-Ezra in Gallé, 24.

expression.<sup>12</sup> All those suggestions have their attractions and all can be supported by other biblical examples.

Their greatest weakness is that they do not explain away the plural **אלהכִּן** of v 47. Furthermore they have no parallel in Daniel's other encounters with kings. When Daniel offers messages and interpretations as from the Lord he normally preserves the distinction between the messenger and the message. This is well illustrated at 4.24 where Daniel breaks off his interpretation of the dream to plead with the king to amend his ways. The Jewish protagonists' use of the phrase, '(if) there is a God' (v 28, **אִיִּי אֱלֹהִי**; 3.17, **הֵן אִיִּי אֱלֹהִים**) functions in the same way to separate the words from the speaker. This is different from the earlier prophetic tradition embodied in phrases such as **נִאֲמַיְדָוָה**, where the speaker and his words are not differentiated. As a result, it is unlikely that Daniel identifies his words as coterminous with God's words, and therefore also unlikely that he suddenly speaks as a member of the heavenly council.<sup>13</sup> It is equally unlikely that the first person plural represents a conventional form of address before the king. Were that the case, we would expect the convention to occur as frequently as others do in Daniel. The use of **קִדְמָה** in the context of approaching the king, and the hope expressed of long life for the king are two such conventions consistently observed in the book of Daniel.

Until more evidence comes to hand a satisfactory explanation of the plurals in vv 36 and 47 is not available. There is no convincing alternative to the obvious answer that they refer to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, but this does not alter the fact that Daniel on his own is clearly the protagonist. Even in the two verses in question, there are also singular pronouns on either side of the plurals. The narrative seems to nod politely in the direction of the three, who remain silent bystanders. Therefore the plurals of vv 36 and 47 alone do not serve as a counter-argument to the view that MT vv 13-23 has been interpolated in

---

<sup>12</sup>Heaton, 130

<sup>13</sup>Koch, 'Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?', 125f, attributes this to a growing sense of transcendence, as a result of which the bearer of revelation could only be an intermediary.

the Aramaic.

Even in the possibly interpolated material, the presence of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah is problematic as nowhere are the three companions seen as the equals of Daniel. The song of praise itself is in the first person singular. It could be objected that Daniel in v 23 includes his compatriots in the phrases '...which we asked...' (דִּי-בַעֲנָא) and 'you made known to us...' (הוֹדַעְתָּנָא). But הוֹדַעְתָּנָא sits uncomfortably in the same verse with the singular suffix on הוֹדַעְתָּי. There are no Aramaic textual witnesses to a singular suffix on the final דַּע of v 23, although there is a singular in Theodotion's translation. This reflects either a singular in  $\theta$ 's *Vorlage* or the translator's unease on narrative grounds with the variation in person in v 23.<sup>14</sup> However, in agreement with MT, he allows for the plural with '...which we asked...' (ὅ ἡξιώσαμεν). The Septuagint translation is not a close equivalent of the existing Aramaic, but does contain the singular form ἡξιώσα in contrast to  $\theta$ .<sup>15</sup> Even if v 23 is not an insertion, the textual doubt surrounding the persons of the verbs and their suffixes makes it uncertain whether or not the plural was intended. Theodotion best reflects the sense of the rest of the chapter, in that the friends of Daniel joined in asking for revelation, but Daniel alone received it.

### the song of praise as insert

These verses also contain the much-discussed song of praise of Daniel. Many commentators recognize in the material of vv 20-23 a song that was probably composed for the present purpose.<sup>16</sup> They also recognize

---

<sup>14</sup>Scribal confusion between the sounds of י and נ suggests itself as an explanation of a different *Vorlage*, or the eye of the copyist may have been confused by the ending on בַּעֲנָא and appropriated that suffix for the final word in the verse. See Klein, 76f, for examples of words which sound alike.

<sup>15</sup>Ziegler, 104, cites two witnesses from the Lucianic recension as well as the Bohairic and Ethiopic in support of the singular ἡξιώσα in  $\theta$ .

<sup>16</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 157, says 'it is an original composition, entirely to the point of the story'. This view is agreeable to many. See for example Goldingay, *Daniel*, 38 and Lacocque, *Daniel*, 45.

it as a distinct and self-contained unit within ch 2.<sup>17</sup> The revelation granted to Daniel (v 19) brings forth a hymn of praise to the God who reveals (v 22). The hymn proceeds from a description of the characteristics of God's wisdom to thanksgiving for the gift of wisdom to Daniel to the specific 'for you have made known to us the matter of the king' (v 23, **דִּי-מַלְתָּ מַלְכָּא הוּדַעְתָּנָא**).

Comparisons are inevitable with the song and prayer that are part of ch 3 in the Greek, and there are certain superficial similarities.<sup>18</sup> They are both uttered by the Jewish heroes in moments of extreme danger. In each case their deliverance has been assured but not yet implemented. There is the same progression in thought from the general concerns of a wider audience towards the particular circumstances of those uttering the praise, Daniel in ch 2 and Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah in ch 3. Despite the particular mention of the heroes, their predicament is not central to the subject matter, but is alluded to. There are two different kinds of grammatical structure in each song. In ch 3 the first few verses (vv 52-56) are addressed by the three directly to God in the second person singular. There is then a switch into a series of imperatives directed at various recipients. God is no longer addressed directly (vv 57-90), but becomes the subject of the commands. Daniel's hymn in ch 2 also has the same two types of sections although they are in reverse order from the Song of the Three. Vv 20-22 is set in the framework of an imperative or jussive sense, 'Blessed be the name of God' (v 20, **לְהוּא שְׁמֵהּ דִּי-אֱלֹהֵא מְבֹרָךְ**). Daniel switches into the first person at v 23 and addresses God directly. Notwithstanding the problematic command to Hananiah and Mishael in 3.88 whereby the singers are suddenly introduced into the song itself, the persona of the singer remains outside the song in both cases. In 3.88 the switch in direction of the song to Hananiah and Mishael has come about in the attempt to contextualize the material.<sup>19</sup> This, along with the change into the first person, indicates the assumption that Azariah was the singer of the song

---

<sup>17</sup>Baldwin, 90, exemplifies this with her analysis of the literary qualities of the song.

<sup>18</sup>See the treatment by Towner, 'Poetic Passages', 326.

<sup>19</sup>See Rothstein, 174, and Moore, 74.

just as Daniel is in ch 2.

Despite the similarities in context and form, however, there are some marked differences in content and syntax. A particular syntactical difference is the way the singer conveys the attributes of the God being praised. In ch 3 the tendency is to portray God through a series of adjectival phrases, particularly in vv 52-56. Only at the end of the song is there specific mention of God's actions on behalf of the singer. The song in ch 2 conveys its information about God through a series of indicative statements all dependent on the **י** of v 20b, explaining why God's name is blessed.<sup>20</sup>

More significant than the syntactical variations are the differences in which aspects of God are highlighted by the hymns. We have seen in an earlier treatment that the sentiments of the Song of the Three are expressed in terms of the created order and of the cult. From v 57 there is a movement through creation to Israel (v 83) to priests and servants and the holy ones (vv 84-87). Hananiah and Mishael (v 88) are thereby set in company with the people of God. The second section (vv 57ff) is a long hymn to the created order, both seen and unseen. The first part is filled with cultic imagery. The 'God of our fathers' (v 52, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν) is depicted in his 'temple' (v 53, τῷ ναῷ) with the 'cherubim' (v 55, χερουβim) and 'on the throne' (v 54, ἐπὶ θρόνου). In contrast, the God of 2.20ff is primarily the one who is the source of secret knowledge, not the one who is revealed in the cult and in creation. He is blessed because he possesses 'wisdom and might' (v 20, חכמה וגבורה) and conveys it 'to the wise...and to those who know' (v 21, לחכמין...לדעין).<sup>21</sup> The vocabulary of verse 22, to which I return

---

<sup>20</sup>Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel*, 41, likens the structure of this 'hymn-prayer' to the Tell Fekherye inscription (Greenfield and Shaffer, 112f) partly on grounds of its use of participles. His comparison ignores the fact that the participles in vv 21f belong with the **י** at the beginning of each verse and so are used indicatively. There is no equivalent in the Tell Fekherye inscription to **י**, or to **י**. See Rosenthal, 55, on this use of the participle as a narrative tense.

<sup>21</sup>Bentzen, *Daniel*, 9f, and Porteous, 43. This chapter can be viewed as illustrating the assertion of Kaufmann, 79, that 'The contrast between YHWH and the magician is...between divine and human wisdom'.

later, intensifies this effect.

There also seem to be different motivations behind the songs. The Prayer of the Three is at least partly penitential in character, so that the ordeal by fire in the Greek versions becomes an act of atonement. Such a motive for praise does not appear in ch 2.<sup>22</sup> Daniel and his companions go to God for help because they are in a corner (v 18). There is no suggestion of penitence in their tone. On balance the ♂ plus in v 18 where Daniel, as well as going to prayer, 'declared a fast' (v 18, παρήγγειλε νηστείαν), probably does not imply penitence either. Certainly there is a strong Old Testament tradition linking fasting to repentance, and paralleling it with the donning of sackcloth and ashes (Neh 9.1, Ps 68/69.10/11 and Is 58.5, for example). But there are other occasions where fasting is part of the plea for help in difficult circumstances. Sometimes the context hints that fasting is part of repentance in acknowledgement that the trouble has come about through sin (2 Sam 12.16 and Zech 7.5). At other times the context is clearly not penitential, and the fast is only part of a cry for help. The clearest examples of this come from later biblical and apocryphal material (2 Chr 20.3, 1 Esdr 8.50 and 2 Mac 13.12). So fasting in the Septuagint of v 18 need not imply the same sort of motivation as lies behind the Song and Prayer of the Three. This contrasts with ch 9 where Daniel's fast (9.3) is obviously penitential on behalf of the nation, and is accompanied by 'sackcloth and ashes' (9.3, שֵׁשׁ וָאֵפֶר).

It should not be thought that these substantial differences between the songs necessarily mean that Daniel's song is any more at home in its context than were the Additions of ch 3.<sup>23</sup> The apparently successful integration of 2.20ff is not as water-tight as it might seem. Apart from the final reference to מֶלֶךְ-מְלָכָא there is nothing that specifically relates to the predicament that Daniel and his friends find themselves in. At the point where the hymn is applied to the current setting there is a change of note. In particular the grammatical persons and moods

---

<sup>22</sup>Gammie, 'Intention and Sources', 290, notes that the aspect of vicarious suffering is missing.

<sup>23</sup>See Rothstein, 174.



change. God is spoken about in vv 20ff and addressed directly in v 23, and the jussive mood at the beginning of the song becomes indicative at v 23 where Daniel adopts the first person. This is reminiscent of what happens in 3.88 where the Song of the Three is probably adjusted to fit its new context.

In terms of vocabulary, the appearance in v 22 of the deep things and the hidden things (עמיקתא ומסתרתא) is unique in Biblical Aramaic. It comes in the midst of a string of references to 'interpretation' (פשר) and 'secrets' (רזין), which are consistently used except at this point. The two words also occur together in Is 29.15, the only instance in Biblical Hebrew where such is the case. That verse contains the only example of מסתר, whereas מעמיקים is relatively common. However it often has a geographical (Is 22.7 for example) or physical (Ez 23.32 for example) referent. Where the sense is metaphorical, it usually refers to the depths of Sheol (Job 11.8) or the human mind (Ps 64.7), and even in later Aramaic does not normally carry the apocalyptic sense of a divine secret which the context of v 22 gives it. The word was a puzzle to the  $\Theta$  and  $\textcircled{C}$  translators, who both render it literally with  $\beta\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ . As with the Hebrew equivalent usually so translated, עמיק (for example in Pr 18.4 and 25.3, and Is 31.6), the adjective modifies the human mind or human action or is used as part of an image of the same. There did not seem to be a different Greek word available to the translators with which to convey the precise sense of the word in this context. This is a further hint that the present setting for the song is unlikely to have been its original one. The rare מסתרתא also supports that argument. It occurs occasionally in later Aramaic meaning 'secret', but even then human secrets are usually intended. Again the present meaning is unique to this context and suggestive of a different original setting.

The imagery of dark and light in v 22 is not used in the same way anywhere else in chs 2-6, not even in the Greek Additions of ch 3, where God is lord of both light and dark (3.71f). It is part of a biblical tradition represented in Job 12.22 and Is 29.15, where interestingly enough 'the deep things' (עמקות in Job, המעמיקים in Isaiah) also feature,

but is not at all common.<sup>24</sup> Such a dualistic use of the imagery is more akin to the Community Rule found at Qumran (1QS III), a document from the first or even late second century BCE.<sup>25</sup> Dating the sources is beyond the scope of this discussion, but the use of imagery and the unusual aspects of vocabulary suggest a different provenance for the Song of ch 2 and so support the view that the hymnic material has been imported into the story.

Despite the attempts at integration, the contents of the Song also echo quite different, and probably later, sentiments. Reference to the God who 'changes the seasons and the times' (v 21, מְדַשֵּׁנָה עֲדָנִיָּה וְזִמְנָה) resonates of the little horn, the arrogant king who sought 'to change seasons' (7.25, לְהַשְׁנִיָּה זִמְנִין) as well as the law. A similar reference is also to be found in the ̡ plus material of 4.37, where the God who 'changes seasons and times' (ἀλλοιοῖ καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους) is acknowledged by Nebuchadnezzar. Both Theodotion and the Septuagint translate v 21 with the identical phrase. The power to remove (עֲרָה) and set up kings (v 21) also reminds the reader of the fate of the arrogant king represented by the little horn in ch 7 (7.26) whose power is taken away (עֲרָה). This is a slightly different tradition from that of ch 4 in Aramaic where the negative power to remove kings is not mentioned alongside the power to set them up (4.14, 22 and 29). However in ̡ 4.37 God removes as well as sets up (ἀφαιρῶν...καὶ καθιστῶν) kings in terms similar to those of the Greek of v 21 (μεθιστῶν...καὶ καθιστῶν). All of this suggests that the Song of Praise in ch 2 has a closer literary relationship with the tradition behind ch 7 and the Septuagint of ch 4 than with its immediate context.

Although there is some ambiguity in the source critical evidence relating to vv 13-23 as outlined above, it seems likely that the material in question has been inserted into an earlier original of the story of

---

<sup>24</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 37

<sup>25</sup>Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 78 and 94. Hartman and DiLella, 140, also draw attention to a link with the War Scroll of Qumran as well as parts of the New Testament, particularly the Johannine writings.

Nebuchadnezzar and his dream statue.<sup>26</sup> Whether or not the song in vv 20-23 is an integrated part of that unit, it is inescapable that the song is not original within the chapter as a whole. The indications are that both 6 and 8 translated a *Vorlage* that already contained vv 13-23. Those are the assumptions about Dan 2.13-23 which will inform the remainder of this literary comparison of the Septuagint and Masoretic Text versions of ch 2.

A literary objection to this conclusion might be that these verses are part of a long build-up to the revelation of the interpretation of the dream and the dream itself. The length of the build-up is a deliberate literary artifice intended to create suspense, and vv 13-23 are integral to that effect.<sup>27</sup> It could be argued that this is the same phenomenon present in the Masoretic Text version of ch 5, where the writing on the wall is central by its absence. There are two possible replies to that argument. One is that it is not of sufficient weight on its own to counter contrary evidence. The other is to note that there is still considerable suspense built into the story without vv 13-23. Daniel does not begin to tell the dream until v 31, which is well over half way through the postulated older version of the story. The reader has to wait through the exchange between Nebuchadnezzar and his officials (vv 1-12), Arioch's mediation (vv 24-26), and Daniel's disclaimer (vv 27-30).<sup>28</sup> Because the dream is not yet known by anyone else, the repeated reference by Daniel in vv 27-30 to the purpose of the dream heightens the suspense.

### **narrative structure**

The type of narrative analysis that has been applied to chs 3-6 is less applicable in the present case. In the nature of a closer translation on the part of the Septuagint, ch 2 contains no variations

---

<sup>26</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 46ff, reaches this conclusion and sees the insertion as part of the process of refashioning a much older kernel to fit the Hellenistic period.

<sup>27</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 42

<sup>28</sup>Fewell, 174

between versions that affect the structure or narrative shape of the story. Apart from divergences that are explicable in technical terms, such differences as there are normally suggest either a different theology or provenance, or some discrepancy in the way point of view is perceived and manipulated within the narrative. A useful starting point for this discussion of narrative technique, then, is to note something that has already been touched on: the primacy of dialogue in both versions. Apart from the bare bones of the setting and what is needed to maintain the clarity of the narrative, no information is imparted directly to the reader in the older version of the story. In this respect the MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  narrators of ch 2 are both as covert and neutral as each other, and therefore potentially ambiguous. They do not anticipate plot developments nor do they attribute motives to the characters.

The characteristic use of a minor figure in furthering the plot is also in evidence in both versions.<sup>29</sup> In fact the appearance of Arioch signals a pivotal shift in focus when vv 13-23 are excluded. Until v 12 the exchange between king and wise men sets the main tensions in place. From vv 26 to the end, the conversation between Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel builds on that platform. Arioch, the executioner, is the vehicle by which the Babylonians are ushered off stage, and Arioch, the intermediary, is the one who then brings on Daniel in their place.<sup>30</sup>

### irony and ambiguity

At a discourse level, the perception of point of view by the reader of this sort of narration is dependent on ironic suggestion and subtlety in variation. Even there the versions are in agreement with each other in many respects. One example of irony centres on the question of the source of the wisdom required to know and interpret the king's dream. The Chaldeans unwittingly encapsulate the issue by declaring that no human could know the answer and only 'the gods' (MT v 11,  $\text{אלהים}$ ) or 'an angel' ( $\mathfrak{G}$  v 11,  $\alphaγγελος$ ) could show it. Thereby the mantic officials not

---

<sup>29</sup>Simon, 14. Arioch is a more functional character than his counterpart in ch 5, the queen.

<sup>30</sup>See Fewell, 53, on the role of Arioch.

only betray their own sources of wisdom as less than divine, but they also set the stage for a subsequent revelation. So Daniel's statement that 'no wise men ...are able to declare...but there is a God' (vv 27f, *לֹא חֲכִימִין...יָכֻלִין לְהַחֲזִידָה...בְּרִם אֵתִי אֱלֹהִים*) who can, is a counterpoint to the earlier incident.<sup>31</sup> The Babylonians' earlier statement is confirmed as true and the superiority of Daniel's God is confirmed.

Some have suspected a touch of gentle irony in other aspects of the story also. In the early stages of the chapter the king seems to hold the whip hand as he exposes his wise men's ignorance of true revelation. Yet it is the wise men who utter the truth of the matter (v 11), albeit accidentally.<sup>32</sup> At the end of the story Nebuchadnezzar's exaggerated and inappropriate homage paid to Daniel's success indicates that he still has not understood fully. The irony remains, this time at the expense of the king.<sup>33</sup> Good goes even further with his suggestion that the story as a whole can be interpreted as the archetypically comic 'impossible task' set by the king and accomplished by Daniel.<sup>34</sup> These aspects are also present in the Septuagint version.

Whether or not we go as far as Good in viewing the story largely in comic terms, it is inescapable that there is a measure of ambiguity about the whole episode. In particular, because of the primacy of dialogue the narrator leaves a measure of inscrutability in the characters of both the king and Daniel. There is no external judgement on the king's behaviour when he worships Daniel at the end and the message given the reader is mixed. In v 46 his worship is focused entirely on the sage, but then his speech of v 47 about 'your God' (*אֱלֹהֵיכֶם*) shifts from Daniel to his God. However, the consequence of his recognition of Daniel's God is completely secular and almost beside the point. The syntax of v 48, which begins 'Then the king set up Daniel' (*וַאֲדָמָן מִלְכָּא לְדַנְיֵאל רַבִּי*), shifts the focus of

---

<sup>31</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 46

<sup>32</sup>Towner, *Daniel*, 32

<sup>33</sup>Porteous, 51. Mastin, 92, echoes Porteous' views.

<sup>34</sup>Good, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy', 50. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 146, finds 'grim humour' in Nebuchadnezzar's setting of the task.

the king's response back onto Daniel. The character of Daniel also contains some puzzles. The most obvious is Daniel's silence in the face of this worship, an aspect that is considered elsewhere. But this is only a reflection of a bigger problem that arises in Daniel's interpretation of the dream. The dream of the statue is primarily a vision of judgement on temporal power along with the eventual supremacy of divine power, and Daniel brings that out in his interpretation. In that light, his emphatic statement to Nebuchadnezzar, 'You are the head of gold' (v 38, **אַתָּה־הוּא רֹאשׁוֹ דִּי דְהָבָא**), is a surprising one as it reduces the disturbing aspects of the vision to political terms.<sup>35</sup> I will return to this element in the story when considering theological differences between the versions. As with the ironic aspects, this ambiguity is also part of the Septuagint translation of this chapter.

### point of view

The above examples do not mean that the narrator is entirely neutral in ch 2. Indeed the Masoretic Text contains several examples of subtle variation in vocabulary which are designed to enhance the reader's perception of the different points of view present in the narrative.<sup>36</sup> It is here that some disparity between MT and G may be detected. Such a variation is an important element in the early part of the narrative where the wise men fail to understand the exact nature of the king's request. There is no talk of 'the interpretation' (**פְּשָׁרָא**) until v 4. Before that the king calls in his functionaries and they are ordered 'to tell the king his dream' (v 2, **לְדַבֵּר לְמֶלֶךְ וּלְמַנְצֵי**). At this stage there is no distinction in the king's mind between dream and interpretation. This is reinforced by the king's next statement that he needs 'to know

---

<sup>35</sup>See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 147, on the distinction between 'eschatological' and 'political'. Fewell, 56ff, explores this ambiguity extensively and well, although her assessment of Daniel as 'one who tells the truth but not the whole truth' does not take account of developments between Daniel and the kings in subsequent chapters.

<sup>36</sup>Niditch and Doran, 188, identify this as a characteristic of Dan 2. Other stories in what they have identified as the literary type of Dan 2 tend to have extended repetition instead. Gen 41 and Ahiqar 5-7 are their other cases in point.



the dream' (v 3, **לדעת את-החלום**).<sup>37</sup> The hapless Chaldeans are not to know that when the king uses **ידע** he is usually thinking of dream and interpretation as a package (vv 5 and 26). They are the first to separate the two when they ask for an account of the dream so that they might interpret (v 4). Only then does Nebuchadnezzar emphasize that he wants to hear both 'the dream and its interpretation' (v 5, **חלמא ופשרה**). The wise men's dawning awareness is marked by a repetition of the request for an account of the king's dream (v 7), weakened this time by the use of a jussive instead of the self-confident imperative of v 4.<sup>38</sup> Both parties are talking at cross purposes, and the contrast between the wise men's abilities and what is required of them is heightened by this ambiguity of usage on the part of the king.

The ambiguity is not as consistently portrayed by the Septuagint, probably as a result of an attempt to clarify its MT-like *Vorlage*. One reason for the Babylonians' misunderstanding of Nebuchadnezzar is that dream and interpretation function as a double object of the same verb in the early speeches of the king. The verb in question is either **ידע** (vv 5 and 9, 'to make known') or **הוד** (v 6 twice, 'to declare'). This characteristic form of expression does not occur when the mantic officials are speaking. Their habit of making dream and interpretation each objects of their own verb (vv 4 and 7) betrays the mind set that keeps them in separate categories. The distinction between the point of view of the king and that of his advisers is not present in the Septuagint because in each of the above instances of speech by the king (vv 5, 6 and 9), 'dream' and 'interpretation' are distinguished by being the objects of their own verb. Moreover the difference in mood between vv 4 and 7, as portrayed in MT, is not inherent in the verb forms chosen by 6.

Closely related to the use of 'dream' and 'interpretation' words is the narrator's deployment of the different declaratory verbs that govern them. They too are varied in order to manipulate viewpoint from within the narrative. To make this clear, it is necessary to examine in some

---

<sup>37</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 41

<sup>38</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 32

detail the way these verbs operate in Daniel 2. We have seen that King Nebuchadnezzar apparently does not distinguish between **ידע** and **חזה** in describing the process of telling and interpreting the dream, nor does he distinguish initially between the functions of telling and interpreting. He begins to do so in the second half of v 9, by which time the Chaldeans have worked out exactly what the king is asking of them and ambiguity is no longer required by the narrative. On that occasion he uses the same term as the wise men, **חזה**, when speaking of the dream's interpretation.

The verb **ידע** has an extremely wide semantic range in both Biblical Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic. The sense of revealing what is known by God or the gods is only one part of that range, and does not occur commonly in Hebrew. The hiphil is more likely to carry that sense (see Dan 8.19) but not inevitably. The Aramaic of Daniel frequently uses **ידע** to portray the idea of revelation (for example 4.3, 5.8 and 7.16), but it also contains the more usual everyday usage (for example 5.22 and 6.11). The second verb most commonly used with **פשר** as its object is **חזה**. In Biblical Aramaic it is almost exclusively a term of mantic practice, whereas there is a strand of the Biblical Hebrew tradition in which it functions as a term of aphoristic wisdom, used in declaring opinions or knowledge about God (see Ps 19.3; Job 32.10 and 17, 36.2). A third verb of revelation in ch 2 is **גלה**.<sup>39</sup> Apart from its several occurrences in this chapter (vv 19, 22, 28, 29, 30 and 47), its only other uses in Biblical Aramaic are in Ezra 4.10 and 5.12. There it simply means 'to be taken into exile'. The word is much more common in Biblical Hebrew where, although the idea of being removed into exile occurs from time to time, the primary sense is of uncovering something previously hidden, whether that be a person's nakedness or the secrets of God. It is nowhere associated with divination, but particularly in the prophets and writings has been used to talk about God's self-revelation.<sup>40</sup> Examples may be seen at Is 22.14, 40.5 and 53.1, and Ps 98.2.

---

<sup>39</sup>This spelling is used to include the alternative **גלה** also. See Rosenthal, 51.

<sup>40</sup>When used in that sense it sometimes takes **סוד** as its object (see Am 3.7 and Pr 20.19). See Brown, 421, who links **סוד** with the Aramaic **ר**, which is also the usual object of **גלה** in Daniel.

Using that information as background, it is possible to discern an emerging pattern in the way the various words are used in Daniel 2. We have already seen the variegated use of terms employed by Nebuchadnezzar. When the wise men speak, however, it is clear that they use **חזו** as a technical term which is never applied to the dream itself. Twice it takes 'interpretation' as its object in the mouths of the wise men (vv 4 and 7). Once it governs the general term **מלה** (v 10, 'matter') which clearly includes the interpretation now that the Chaldeans recognize the double focus of Nebuchadnezzar's request. The other occasion is in v 11 when they tell the king that there is nobody who can 'declare it' (**יחזנה**), referring back to the 'matter'.<sup>41</sup>

So far in the MT account the vocabulary used in this regard is consistent with the point of view and understanding of the heathen king and his advisers. Daniel has a different outlook and his choice of verbs when talking about interpretation and revelation reflects that outlook. At first he uses **חזו** in common with the other protagonists (vv 16, 24 and 27). We set aside the instance of v 16 for the time being as that is part of the larger question of how to deal with literary differences in vv 13-23. In v 24 Daniel is speaking to Arioch and reflects that functionary's perspective on Daniel as one of a kind with all the others he has been ordered to kill. In v 27 he is speaking to Nebuchadnezzar and uses **חזו** to describe in their own terms the activities of the Babylonians. Daniel's speech to the king continues in v 28 but now he is explaining the role of God in revealing mysteries.

It is then (v 28) that he uses **גלל**, the word used uniquely in this chapter in connection with God's revelation. This is also true of vv 19 and 22 in the inserted material. Several times (vv 28, 29 and 30) the verb occurs in conjunction with **ידע**. On each occasion the object of **גלל** is 'secret(s)' (**רז** or **רזין**), whereas the phrase containing **ידע** describes the consequence of the uncovered secret. By this stage in the story it is clear that only God can reveal (**גלל**) the particular secret which no human agent, not even Daniel on his own, can reveal (**חזו**). In the light

---

<sup>41</sup>According to BHS some manuscripts witness to **יחזנה**. That tradition would strengthen the impression of **חזו** as a technical term in the mouths of the wise men.

of all this, the verb chosen by Nebuchadnezzar in v 47 is significant. By using גלל to describe the revelatory actions of both God and Daniel he recognizes the unique actions of God and the distinctiveness of the role that Daniel has played compared to the other wise men. At the same time his application of the word demonstrates further Nebuchadnezzar's inability to differentiate between Daniel and his God, a point to which we return in a later section.

The process whereby points of view are distinguished by MT is further illustrated by examining the various objects of the verbs just discussed: 'interpretation' (פֶּשֶׁר), 'dream' (חֶלֶם), and 'secret' (רֵז). Once the smoke screen created by Nebuchadnezzar's deliberately obscure use of חֶלֶם has begun to clear, the distinction between 'dream' and 'interpretation' is respected, but at the same time a third concept holding dream and interpretation together begins to emerge. At first the dream and interpretation together is referred to by the Chaldeans with the neutral 'matter' (vv 10f, מַלְאָה). After that the content intended by מַלְאָה is conveyed into the wisdom term רֵז ('secret', vv 27-29). Gradually it becomes clear to the reader that the matter of the king is a dream and an interpretation, which together constitute a secret that God must reveal.<sup>42</sup> There is a further development in thought as Daniel spells out to the king that the particular secret in question is what will take place (v 29) 'at the end of the days' (v 28, בְּאַחֲרֵית יְמֵיָא) or 'after this' (v 45, אַחֲרֵי דְנָה). In that context Daniel's use of רֵז as the object of חוה in v 27 is surprising but effective. By noting that the other wise men have not been able to 'declare' (v 27, חוה) the 'secret' (v 27, רֵז) he recalls and encapsulates the irony of the early exchanges between Nebuchadnezzar and his officials, whose skills only ran to interpretation (פֶּשֶׁר) when it was secrets (רֵזִין) that really needed uncovering.<sup>43</sup> After this pivotal verse, the vocabulary particular to the revelation of God's secrets through his agent is used exclusively.

Identification of points of view within the narrative by choice of

---

<sup>42</sup>See Beale, *The Use of Daniel*, 13f, on the fact that רֵז includes content and interpretation.

<sup>43</sup>Compare Horgan, 237, who says that פֶּשֶׁר corresponds to רֵז at Qumran.

vocabulary does not occur to the same extent within the Septuagint. It is true that the distinction between פֶּשֶׁר and חֵן of MT is largely preserved. פֶּשֶׁר is normally translated as σύγκρισις or κρίσις (vv 4, 5, 6, 9, 26, 36 and 45) although πάντα (v 16) and ἕκαστα (vv 24f) are exceptions that probably both represent כֻּל in the Aramaic. חֵן is always translated with μυστήριον. So the pattern of the objects of interpretation verbs in MT is also discernible in ̣ but this is not backed up by the choice of verbs governing them. As well as the interpretative practice of ̣ in vv 5f already alluded to, the Septuagint uses no less than 9 verbs to represent the 3 Aramaic ones just discussed. Taking into account the speaker, his listener, and the subject of the conversation, there is no consistent pattern of usage evident. Even the patterns visible in Theodotion contain an unusual number of exceptions. For example יָדַע is usually rendered in ̣ by γινώσκω or γνωρίζω (vv 3, 5, 23, 29, 30 and 45) but sometimes ἀναγγέλλω is used (vv 9, 25 and 26). Yet that word or its cousin ἀπαγγέλλω is also the usual translation of חָזַן (vv 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 16, 24 and 27). Theodotion is most consistent in its representation of גִּלָּה by ἀποκαλύπτω.

Ἀποκαλύπτω is the one Greek word for telling or revealing in the present chapter that has particular mantic connotations, and is thereby the most appropriate translation of גִּלָּה. However even here the Septuagint is surprisingly loose in its choice of words. ̣ usually translates גִּלָּה with ἀνακαλύπτω (vv 22, 28 and 29) or ἐκφαίνω (vv 19, 30 or 47), two words which it seems to treat as synonyms. Once it also uses δηλόω (v 47) even though that word has already been used extensively to represent both יָדַע and חָזַן. The result is that the distinction between divine revelation and the type on offer from the Chaldeans is not as clearly drawn in ̣, nor is the impact of Nebuchadnezzar's confession heightened to the same extent. It is true that ἐκφαίνω in v 47 may have particular revelatory connotations, but δηλόω (also v 47) does not carry a specialized sense.

A further variation between MT and ̣ is in their observation of the distinction between 'dreams' and 'visions'. The two words used in the Aramaic section of Daniel are חֶזוֹ ('vision') and חֲלֹם ('dream'), and their usage there suggests a distinction in meaning. Although any type of dream or vision in the night is regarded as communication from outside,

חזו is used to denote visions that are explicitly from the God of Daniel as opposed to the 'dreams' the Babylonians have.<sup>44</sup> Daniel is the recipient of visions while Nebuchadnezzar has dreams. Theodotion invariably translates חזו with ὄραμα and חלם with ἐνύπνιον, which suggests that a distinction between the two words was recognized and preserved in translation.<sup>45</sup>

The situation in the Hebrew chapters is not so clear cut. In Biblical Hebrew the infrequently occurring מַחֲזֶה carries the same sort of meaning as its Aramaic equivalent (Gen 15.1 and Jb 7.14). Another word מִשָּׁא is peculiar to Isaiah and speaks of divine revelation through a prophetic utterance or oracle (Is 15.1, 21.11, 22.1 and 23.1). The most common word is מֵרָאָה which can denote a divine vision (Gen 46.2 for example), but it can simply refer to a sight of some significance (for example Dt 28.67). Although חֶלֶם often carries the general meaning of its Aramaic counterpart, it is also used in parallel with מַחֲזֶה in Jb 7.14. Moreover it is sometimes used on its own with the sense of divine revelation as is the case in Gen 37.5-10. In the Hebrew of Daniel, חֶלֶם is not used in this way. In fact, in chs 8-12 the only visions or dreams spoken of are the revelatory ones experienced by Daniel. Two words, מַחֲזֶה (8.1, 2, 17 and 26; 9.21 and 24; 10.14) and מֵרָאָה (8.16, 26 and 27; 9.23; 10.7, 8 and 16) are used in these chapters more or less synonymously. It would seem likely then that the same more secular understanding of חֶלֶם is preserved in the Hebrew section of Daniel.

The distinction between חֶלֶם and חזו becomes another means by which the MT portrays point of view in ch 2. The conversation between Nebuchadnezzar and the wise men in the first 9 verses is couched entirely in terms of the 'dream' (חֶלֶם, vv 1-7 and 9). Later on when Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar discuss the latter's dream they also speak of חֶלֶם (vv 26 and 36). Even at the end of the chapter when Daniel's intervention has turned the dream into a message from God, it is still only a 'dream' (v

---

<sup>44</sup> According to Slotki, 12, a vision is a revelation from God 'superior to that by a "dream"'.

<sup>45</sup> Despite the observation by McCrystall, 152ff, that ὄραμα and ἐνύπνιον are not wholly exclusive, they seem to be treated as distinctive terms by θ.



45). Daniel, on the other hand, perceived the dream and its interpretation through a 'vision' (v 19, חזון). By his choice of the same vocabulary used predominantly in ch 7 (7.1, 7, 13 and 15) to denote Daniel's visions, the narrator reinforces the message that this vision comes from God.

Normally the Septuagint observes the same sort of differentiation in meaning. In ch 4, at least where ⑤ seems to represent the same material as MT, the Aramaic חלם always has ἐνύπνιον (4.2/5, 15/18 and 16/19) as its Greek counterpart. In ch 7 'vision' (חזון) is always translated by ὄραμα. It may be no more than an inconsistency on the part of the translator, but in ch 2 ⑤ uses ἐνύπνιον and ὄραμα almost synonymously. As a result the Septuagint narrative does not deploy the words like its MT counterpart to distinguish point of view. The translator usually represents חלם with ἐνύπνιον but not inevitably. In vv 7, 26, 36 and 45 he uses ὄραμα, and in v 1 the 'dreams' (חלמות) of MT are 'visions and dreams' (ὀράματα καὶ ἐνύπνια) according to ⑤.

#### narratorial stance

A more obvious difference in the narrative technique of the versions occurs at v 12. The Aramaic tells the reader that Nebuchadnezzar 'was angry and very furious' (בנס וקצף שגיא).<sup>46</sup> This is further confirmed by the ensuing extreme command issued by the king. While both verbs are rare in Biblical Aramaic, their meanings are well attested in Targums, and קצף is also a common word in Biblical Hebrew. Theodotion represents the hendiadys in the expected way with ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ πολλῇ. It could be argued that this is an overt statement on the part of the narrator, although such emotion is normally clearly visible to the observer. However ⑤ suggests that the king 'became sad and in great sorrow...' (στυγνὸς γενόμενος καὶ περίλυπος). Although στυγνὸς can contain a sense of hostility in certain contexts, it also means 'sorrowful / gloomy'. The likelihood that it should be so understood here is heightened by its proximity to περίλυπος, which can only mean 'sorrow'. It is difficult to

---

<sup>46</sup>One of several hendiadys in ch 2. Others may be found in vv 9, 22 and 23. See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 43, for a comprehensive look at stylistic features of ch 2.

see how this interpretation by the Septuagint could be solely due to a misunderstanding of the Masoretic Text.<sup>47</sup> Whatever its source, this depiction of the king's emotional state is something that owes more to the editorial omniscience of the narrator than to the observations of the reader. It is difficult also to see how sorrow gives rise to an order to massacre a whole raft of officialdom, unless it were at the thought of the resultant administrative chaos. But this is an exceptional case within ch 2 and may well be a textual rather than a translational issue. It is nevertheless a further indication that within the same narrative structure as MT, the Septuagint account does not exhibit the same degree of ambiguity and irony normally associated with covert narration in Daniel.

### literary devices

One particular play on words in MT is not available to the Greek versions. We have already seen the importance of the verb גָּלָה (vv 19, 22, 28, 30 and 47) in the manipulation of point of view. In the haphel form it means to 'deport' just as its Hebrew equivalent does in the hiphil. The noun arising from this in the Aramaic is גָּלוּ, which means 'exile'. Daniel is himself identified by Arioch as one 'from the sons of the exile of Judah' (v 25, מִן־בְּנֵי גִלְתָּא דִּי יְהוּדָא). A verbal link is thereby made between God the revealer and Daniel the exile, through whom God is able to reveal. Despite a literal translation by Θ (ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῶν υἱῶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας), the link cannot be drawn in the Greek.

The Septuagint is also coy about the fate Nebuchadnezzar promises the wise men in the event of their failure. In the Masoretic Text, the king provides a vivid incentive for them with the promise that they will be 'made into limbs' (v 5, הָדַמְנָן תִּהְיֶינָה בָּדָן) and their 'houses made a dung heap' (בְּתִיכֶן נֹלֵי תִשְׁמֹן). The Septuagint holds out hope of a slightly longer future for them with the suggestion that in the event of failure 'you will be made an example of and your possessions will be taken into

---

<sup>47</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 153, wonders if the first element, בֹּנֵס, has been read by Θ as סָס ('be sick, grieve'), but does not attempt to explain the presence of περίλυπος.

the king's treasury' (παραδειγματισθήσεσθε καὶ ἀναληφθήσεται ὑμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν). The imagery is not unique in the Aramaic of Daniel (see 3.29/96). Theodotion translates it in ch 3 almost exactly as he does in this verse, so the *Vorlage* was likely on both occasions to be what we now find in the Masoretic Text. In ch 3 ̣ translates 'dismembered' literally (διαμελισθήσεται) but shifts the fate of the property from destruction to confiscation. The evidence of ch 3 indicates that the difference came about in the process of translation. Montgomery suggests that 'to be made an example of' came about through a reading of ܕܡܝܢ as a form of the verb ܕܡܐ, while 'dunghill' was understood as 'booty' under the influence of an Arabic cognate.<sup>48</sup> Whatever the reasons for this interpretative translation, the evocative imagery of MT is not a feature of ̣ at this point.

This is not to deny the art of the Septuagint translator, which shows in the occasional felicitously balanced phrasing that serves to emphasize and summarize the key issues. Such is the case with the contention that 'the vision is accurate and this interpretation trustworthy' (v 45, ἀκριβὲς τὸ ὄραμα καὶ πιστὴ ἡ τούτου κρίσις). The same balance is evident in 4.27 and 6.13. A further link with those verses is also drawn through the use of ἀκριβὴς at the start of each of the phrases.

### interpretation of the dream

Just as there are differences in literary effect between MT and ̣, so there are variations in content. These could signify nothing more than a latitude in translation technique but cumulatively they hint at significant differences between the versions. A close look at the dream and its interpretation provides some instances. Two small differences are most likely to be technical questions of translation or transmission. The rock not quarried by human hands struck the statue and then in MT 'filled' (v 35, ܡܠܐ) all the earth. In ̣, as well as striking the statue, it 'struck' (v 35, ἐπάταξε) all the earth. This meaning does not seem to fit with the development of thought in Daniel's interpretation of

---

<sup>48</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 148f

the dream. That argument on its own is not compelling, as logic is not a reliable criterion by which to judge dreams, but it also denies the interpretation of the dream in both MT and ̡. In the interpretation there is a distinction between the sovereignty represented by the image and the subject of its rule, the earth. The rock not hewn by human hands has a double function, firstly to dethrone the image by striking it on its feet, and then to exercise its own sovereignty over the earth by filling it. The contest is not with the earth but with the image. This is confirmed by both versions in v 44. To describe the stone as smashing both the statue and its subjects works against such use of the imagery. The possibilities of a different Aramaic *Vorlage* or a misreading of the MT remain speculative. It is more likely either that the earlier verb in v 35 has been misapplied by the translator in the last part of the verse, or that ̡ has read מוח (v 34) for מלח.<sup>49</sup>

Another difference of the same type is the inclusion by MT of 'and toes' (v 41, ואצבעתא) where the Septuagint makes no mention of them. Both versions devote v 42 to the significance of the 'toes of the feet' (אצבעת רגליא in MT, οἱ δάκτυλοι τῶν ποδῶν in ̡). It has been suggested that v 42 has been interpolated, perhaps to bring the vision into line with the ten horns of ch 7 by reference to ten toes. V 41 has therefore been amended by the addition of ואצבעתא, so the argument goes, and its absence in ̡ is evidence of that process.<sup>50</sup> If the Septuagint is a translation of a *Vorlage* that contains the toes and their significance, this argument breaks down. And such seems to be the case in that v 42 in Greek is syntactically close to the Aramaic. This is strikingly the case in that the construct relationship between the toes and the feet in MT is also represented in ̡, despite the fact that they are simply linked by ו in the previous verse. It is therefore possible that the Septuagint was translating a *Vorlage* which did not include ואצבעתא in v 41, and that the variation has arisen in the transmission of the Masoretic Text. There need not be a problem with extra detail inserted into the interpretation

---

<sup>49</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 171, prefers the latter explanation.

<sup>50</sup>This argument is epitomized by Hartman and DiLella, 141. Stuart, 65, in a much earlier commentary, also connects the ten toes with the ten horns of ch 7.

that was not included in the original revelation. The same phenomenon is observable in ch 5 as well as the interpretation of Daniel's vision in ch 7.<sup>51</sup>

A more extensive variation is found in v 40, but again the difference does not have literary consequences. At one level it could be seen as an attempt to tidy up what is generally reckoned to be a corrupt verse in the Masoretic Text. This, however, does not account for the appearance from nowhere of the phrase 'hews down every tree' (v 40, πᾶν δένδρον ἐκκόπτων). The explanation offered by Charles is that כּל-אֵלִין in MT has been misread by either the translator of *Θ* or the producer of his *Vorlage* as כּל-אֵלִין.<sup>52</sup> Again the difference probably has a technical explanation.

It is tempting to cite the Septuagint rendering of v 29 as evidence of an extended interpretation of the dream in the mind of the translator. Where MT speaks of 'what will happen after this' (v 29, מָה דִּי לְהוּא אַחֲרֵי דְנָה) the Septuagint has what appears to be the somewhat stronger expression, 'which must happen at the last days' (v 29, ὅσα δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν).<sup>53</sup> Is this evidence of a more eschatological focus on the part of *Θ*, which sees the statue struck by the rock as a series of kingdoms rather than a single entity? Do the differences between the versions therefore represent the same opinions that have divided commentators ever since?<sup>54</sup> Any answer must include an exploration of the uses of δεῖ and ἔσχατος. The former could introduce a suggestion of a predetermined course of action into the text, but in fact

---

<sup>51</sup>See again Eissfeldt, 112, who calls this a feature of style.

<sup>52</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 48

<sup>53</sup>Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 24, maintains that δεῖ here implies necessity.

<sup>54</sup>See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 185ff, for an extended treatment. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 57ff, considers that 'The statue represents the empire led by Nebuchadnezzar. It is a single statue, a single empire...'. Many modern commentators agree. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 51, however, considers that 'les perspectives dernières' are not entirely absent. Jepheth, 13, as well as Young, *Daniel*, 78, represent a more eschatological interpretation. More recently Lucas, 'Four Empires', 194, speaks of a 'Jewish perception of history' in Daniel 2 and 7.

its use in the Septuagint is not always particularly deterministic. There is no syntactical equivalent of the impersonal  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  in Hebrew or Aramaic and its appearance is often an attempt to translate the Hebrew construction of  $\text{ל}$  plus the infinitive as an expression of necessity (for example, Esth 1.15). It is possible that the sight of the irregular Aramaic form  $\text{לדורא}$  has brought forth that sort of translation.

The use of  $\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in Greek tends to have a more absolute than relative sense, in that it refers to the last rather than the latter things. That is certainly the sense conveyed in the New Testament and appropriated by Christian usage. However that can be misleading when it comes to discerning meaning in the Septuagint. Its numerous appearances in Septuagintal Greek usually represent some form of the Hebrew or Aramaic  $\text{אָדֶר}$ . This root has a wider range of meaning than  $\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , and can take both ultimate and relative senses. The Septuagint tends to use a form of  $\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in both senses, and so the word in the Septuagint has come to reflect the same range of meaning as  $\text{אָדֶר}$ .<sup>55</sup> By and large it appears in Aramaic either as a feminine noun in the construct state ( $\text{אָדֶרִית}$ ), which normally carries an absolute meaning, or as the prepositional  $\text{אָדֶרִי}$ , which simply means 'after'. In Hebrew the grammatical range is wider, including adjectival, adverbial and various nominal forms, sometimes with an eschatological and sometimes with a temporal sense. For example the good wife of Proverbs 31 looks ahead in a purely secular sense 'to the days to come' (Pr 31.25,  $\text{לַיּוֹם אֲחֵרִין}$ ), whereas the song of Moses in Dt 32 looks ahead to 'the end' (Dt 32.20,  $\text{אֲחֵרִיתָם}$ ). The Septuagint uses  $\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in both contexts. It was the most appropriate option available to both  $\text{ט}$  and  $\text{ת}$  when they encountered the preposition  $\text{אָדֶרִי}$ , as they have done in vv 29 and 45. They could have used  $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$  but that would not have quite captured the forward-looking nature of  $\text{אָדֶרִי}$ , or its significance as a word used on important occasions. In the Hebrew sections of Daniel,  $\text{אָדֶר}$  appears in the form of the feminine noun and reflects a sense of finality (8.19 and 23; 10.14; 11.29; 12.8).

Daniel 2 MT is not clear whether the events of the vision represent

---

<sup>55</sup> See Walters, 143ff, on this phenomenon.



the end or the next stage. Whereas v 28 speaks with some finality of 'the end of the days' (בְּאַחֲרֵית יְמֵי), vv 29 and 45 in MT simply speak of what will be 'after these things' (אַחֲרֵי דָנָה).<sup>56</sup> The Septuagint or its *Vorlage* is identical to MT at v 28 with ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. However, it retains that reading for the rest of the chapter where MT has the weaker sense. This comes about partly because ̣ has followed the lead provided by Septuagintal Greek in using ἔσχατος to translate אַחֲרֵי. The continuing inclusion of τῶν ἡμερῶν as a plus, however, at least suggests a predilection on the part of ̣ for seeing the vision in terms of the last days rather than the next days. It seems to be something more than a careless lapse into an expression encountered earlier in the chapter. While it is certain that ἔσχατος can bear eschatological implications in the Septuagint, as it clearly does in Sir 48.24 for example, to suggest that it does so particularly in the ̣ pluses in question remains only a possibility. This possibility is further explored in the context of possible differences in theology and provenance.

#### differences in theological outlook

Because the ̣ story is closer to MT in ch 2 than in 3-6, there is not the same opportunity for the Septuagint to exhibit an independent point of view. There are however several differences that together reflect the same ideology that has been observed elsewhere. First of all 'the gods' (v 11, אֱלֹהִין) become 'an angel' (ἄγγελος) in the Septuagint. Apart from that the two versions of v 11 are in substantial agreement with one another. Even the unusual phrase in MT, 'whose dwelling is not with flesh' (דִּי מְדֻרְהוֹן עִם-בָּשָׂר לֹא אִתְּחוּדִי) is only slightly different in the Septuagint (οὗ οὐκ ἔστι κατοικητήριον μετὰ πάσης σαρκός). This makes it likely that the change occurred at the point of translation. It is a surprising one because the speakers are the Chaldeans, and there can hardly be an objection to their espousal of a polytheistic perspective. It would seem that the Septuagint is so alert to departures in the text from strict monotheism that it amends אֱלֹהִין wherever it is encountered, even when it is spoken by pagans. The same thing happens to the words of King Nebuchadnezzar at 3.25/92, where he says in ̣ that the fourth figure

---

<sup>56</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 41, notes the tension and explains it as a Babylonian oracle glorifying Nebuchadnezzar modified by Jewish redaction.

in the furnace was like 'an angel of God' (ἄγγελου θεοῦ). The MT equivalent is 'a son of the gods' (בן-אלהין). The more monotheistic stance of ̣ is similarly demonstrated at 3.28/95 and 6.28.

This stance also appears in the Septuagint's ascription of titles to God.<sup>57</sup> We have already noted a tendency on the part of ̣ to use κύριος when talking of or to God (3.28/95, for example).<sup>58</sup> The same tendency is noticeable in ch 2 at vv 18 and 37.<sup>59</sup> In both cases MT reads 'God of heaven' (אלה שמיא), probably a term used in the Persian diaspora, while the Septuagint has the variant equivalent 'the Lord Most High' (v 18, τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ὑψίστου) or 'the Lord of heaven' (v 37, ὁ κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).<sup>60</sup> In vv 20 and 23, also, the Septuagint substitutes κύριος for אלה.

In that connection another expression that merits attention is the title 'king of kings' (v 37, מלך מלכיא) ascribed by Daniel to King Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>61</sup> Given ̣'s suspicion of any divinity being attributed to the king, particularly as demonstrated in chs 3 and 6, it is surprising that this expression also occurs in the Old Greek.<sup>62</sup> The argument that it is merely a conventional Persian form of address is a convincing one as far as the Aramaic is concerned.<sup>63</sup> It is a title assumed by Artaxerxes in Ezra 7.12, and it is given to Nebuchadnezzar by God himself in Ez 26.7,

---

<sup>57</sup>The reading by Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 86n, of MT vv 27f as a monotheistic statement is unconvincing.

<sup>58</sup>Schmitt, 20

<sup>59</sup>See the discussion of Jeansonne, 63f. She notes the ̣ rendering in 2.28 as an exception to this tendency.

<sup>60</sup>See Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel*, 49, on the parallel from Tell Fekherye. See also Montgomery, *Daniel*, 159, Lacocque, *Daniel*, 44, Hartman and DiLella, 139, and Bevan, 72. Hanhart, 348, explains the ̣ variation as a response to the syncretistic possibilities of a more literal translation (such as that of ̣) in a Hellenist environment.

<sup>61</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 171

<sup>62</sup>Slotki, 37, records the rabbinic reinterpretation of this verse: 'the king of kings who is the God of heaven'.

<sup>63</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 44. Wiseman, *Nebuchadnezzar*, 41, deems it not unlikely that Nebuchadnezzar described himself thus.

so it is likely that Daniel was using it as nothing more than a polite form.<sup>64</sup> In both places it is witnessed to in the Septuagint translation, although the syntax surrounding the Ezekiel reference indicates a parenthetical function for the title.<sup>65</sup> In the light of this rather scarce evidence it would appear that the Septuagint accepts the Aramaic terminology in the spirit with which it was offered by Daniel.

The Septuagint's acceptance of Nebuchadnezzar's extravagant response to Daniel's success is even more of a puzzle. Not only does the king fall on his face and 'worship' (v 46, סגד) the sage, but he calls on those present to perform cultic rites in Daniel's honour. סגד is the same word used throughout ch 3 (vv 5-7, 10-12, 14, 15, 18 and 28) to describe the homage paid to the statue. While the exact object of their worship remains an open question in MT ch 3, the dominating sense of the word in later Aramaic as well as Biblical Hebrew has to do with worship, and the same is likely to be true of the Aramaic in Daniel.<sup>66</sup> It is inescapable here that the king is offering the kind of homage due to divinity while Daniel remains unperturbed about this state of affairs.<sup>67</sup> The Septuagint makes no attempt to modify the king's extravagance in so doing. The translation of v 46 is close to the Aramaic in MT, including the use of προσκυνέω to represent סגד. The Greek even more firmly demands a divine object for the verb. It is the word used throughout ch 3 as equivalent to סגד, and almost without exception in the Old Greek translation of Biblical Hebrew it translates the hithpael השתחווה with its strong connotations of bowing down in worship of divinity. This usage of προσκυνέω is well illustrated in both versions of Bel and the Dragon (v 4) where the worship of Bel by the king and God by Daniel is couched in the same terms.

The problem is not so much that Daniel is worshipped by

---

<sup>64</sup>Heaton, 131

<sup>65</sup>Rahlf's brackets around the phrase indicate the same.

<sup>66</sup>See Mastin, 82, and Lacocque, *Daniel*, 52.

<sup>67</sup>The medieval commentators all struggled with the problem. Rashi, in Gallé, 28, solves the problem by believing that Daniel did not accept the king's worship.

Nebuchadnezzar as that he does not demur on finding himself the object of such homage. The usual explanation is that in his limited pagan understanding Nebuchadnezzar perceives Daniel's God through Daniel, and so worships Daniel as the human representative.<sup>68</sup> This is understood by Daniel to be the case hence no objection is made. The argument goes that the king's subsequent words to Daniel, 'your God is the God of gods' (v 47, אֱלֹהִים הוּא אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים) makes clear his line of thought.<sup>69</sup> He offers homage to Daniel because Daniel's God is worthy of it. According to Josephus a parallel incident took place in the career of Alexander when he entered Jerusalem.<sup>70</sup> On first entering the city he 'prostrated himself before the Name' (προσεκύνησε τὸ ὄνομα) on the high priest's mitre. He then explained that it was not the high priest he worshipped but the God he represented. That the Septuagint also witnesses to a text very close to MT in v 47 suggests that 5 follows this line of thought.

It is also possible that 5 merely reflects the ambiguity of Daniel's response to royal rewards that is seen in other stories. In ch 5 Daniel scorns Belshazzar's promise of a reward, yet later accepts the same despite his message that the kingdom is essentially finished (5.29). In this instance Daniel identifies Nebuchadnezzar as the head of gold while ignoring, deliberately or not, the irony that at another level the interpretation dooms the entity of which the king is the present head. He then accepts promotion in that entity. In both of these cases the Septuagint also accepts the stance adopted by Daniel towards the gentile sovereign.

#### **differing traditions about Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar**

Our comparison of the interpretation of the dream above hinted that the Septuagint understands Nebuchadnezzar's dream in more eschatological terms, as compared to the Masoretic Text's more political outlook. The possibility becomes more likely when the greater differences in

---

<sup>68</sup>For example Montgomery, *Daniel*, 181.

<sup>69</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 52

<sup>70</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities* XI.331-335

provenance are examined.<sup>71</sup> Earlier in the present chapter I argued that the ̕ plus reference to fasting (v 18) does not imply a different function for the song of praise in the Septuagint. It does, however, provide a starting point for a discussion on provenance, as it hints at a different view on the role of Daniel lurking behind the ̕ translation. Fasting in the Old Testament is only occasionally an individual activity. Such is the case when David manifests grief for his dead child (2 Sam 12.16) and in the Psalms (Ps 34/35.13, 68/69.10/11 and 108/109.24). Usually a fast is something that the leader of a community calls and the implementation of the order is a communal activity. This is certainly so in the late biblical and apocryphal instances cited in our earlier discussion (2 Chr 20.3, 1 Esdr 8.50 and 2 Mac 13.12). When the fasting is an expression of repentance at Neh 9.1 it is also something called by the leadership of Israel. This aspect of the calling of the fast is not so apparent in the prophetic references, but the later prophetic traditions in particular mention fasting as if it were a communal or national activity (Zech 7.5 and 8.19; Is 58, for example).

Daniel's calling of a fast implies an audience much wider than the three companions, and suggests that the architect of ̕ envisages him already in a position of leadership within the exilic community of Jews. There are further hints in the comparison of MT and ̕ in ch 2 that this might be the case. The ones in danger in the Masoretic Text are 'Daniel and his companions' (v 18, דניאל וחבריו). Following as it does the description of Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael as 'his companions' (v 17, חבריו), this reference can only apply to the three young men. However in the Septuagint the targets of Nebuchadnezzar's wrath are 'Daniel and those with him' (v 18, Δανιηλ καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ). They are described in similar terms in v 13. There is no evidence within the story that the three companions are the same ones as those who are with Daniel. Indeed ̕ concurs with MT in describing the three as Daniel's 'companions' (v 17, συνεταίρους), as distinct from οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ. The link then between vv

---

<sup>71</sup>The difference between אַרְמִי (Aramaic) and Συριστί ('Syriac') in v 4 is of no significance. This is the standard ̕ translation (see 2 Ki 18.26, Ezra 4.7 and Is 36.11). Indeed אַרְם is often translated with Σύρια, and אַרְמִי usually with σύρος in the Septuagint. Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.144, tells us of Ἀραμαίους...οὓς Ἕλληνες Συρούς προσαγορεύουσιν ('Arameans...whom the Greeks term Syrians').

17 and 18 is that after sharing the problem with his three companions, Daniel declares a fast for the whole threatened community. This is quite different from the link in MT necessitated by the repetition of **תברודי**. It is also different from the reference in 3.49 to 'those with Azariah' (**τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀζαριαν**). The choice of preposition is not the same and the referent is clearly the companions who entered the fire with Azariah.

The picture of Daniel as an established leader amongst the exiles is reinforced by Arioch's description of Daniel to the king in ᠖. There, Arioch tells the king that he has found among the exiles of Judah 'a wise man' (v 25, **ἄνθρωπον σοφὸν**). In MT he merely finds a man among the exiles. Therefore the promotion of Daniel in ᠖ is from a leader of the exiles to leader of the wise men in Babylon, whereas his promotion in MT is from one of the exiles to a leader in the empire. One consequence of this view is that the contest element is played down in ᠖, just as it is entirely absent in chs 4 and 5 in comparison to MT.

It cannot be denied that this strand of Daniel as an already established member of the group labeled 'wise men' (**חכמים**) is also present in the Masoretic Text. The law goes out to kill the wise men of Babylon (v 12), the killing commences (v 13a) 'and' (ו) Daniel and his companions are recognized as part of the target group for the king's assassins (v 13b). V 18 is more explicit with its reference to 'with the rest of the wise men of Babylon' (**עם שאר חכמי בבל**). However all of those references are from the inserted vv 13-23. The Septuagint translation of those verses brings no changes to the view of Daniel's position, but highlights it further in the remainder of the chapter.

The same process was discernible in previous chapters studied where issues of individual Jewish conduct in exile are reinterpreted in terms of the Jewish nation. The tradition of leadership of the exiles occurs in ᠖ at the end of ch 3 where the three young men are promoted with special responsibility for the Jews in the kingdom (3.30/97). The Greek Additions show a concern for the fate of the nation and contain images related to the cult, as well as showing a tendency to hebraize the characters of the three companions. The Daniel of ᠖ ch 6 has been noted as a precursor to the tradition of Zerubbabel as leader of the exilic community (1 Esdr 4.47ff). Daniel's qualities as a wise man are



similarly emphasized by ⑤ in 5.11ff. In short, the Daniel of the Septuagint is the one who began his career among the Jews in the story of Susanna, which sets the scene for all these other stories in the canonical tradition of the Septuagint.<sup>72</sup>

The Masoretic Text and the Septuagint also diverge in their treatment of Nebuchadnezzar. In MT v 38 the function of the opening phrase **וּבְכָל־דֵּי הָאָרֶץ** is not entirely clear. It could be the object of **יָהּ**, with the subsequent list in apposition. However in that case the **ב** in **בְּכָל** is a problem as it does not normally indicate the object of **יָהּ**. It could express 'amongst all that live, he has given...' as a way of emphasizing God's choice of Nebuchadnezzar. The latter emphasis also results when the phrase is read with the first item in the list, 'sons of men' (**בְּנֵי־אָדָם**), to give an opening 'Out of all the sons of men who live...'. While none of these solutions are flawless, they all view Nebuchadnezzar's dominion over creation on a level with his sovereignty over his human subjects. Grammatically, apart from its placing at the head of the list, 'sons of men' (**בְּנֵי־אָדָם**) is in the same category as 'beasts of the field' (**חַיַּת הַבְּרָא**) and 'birds of heaven' (**עוֹף שָׁמַיָא**). In contrast the Septuagint does not represent the **ל** at the beginning of the verse and so connects the first phrase with what has preceded it in v 37. The effect of this syntactical difference is to distinguish the sovereignty exercised by Nebuchadnezzar over his human subjects from his dominion over nature, and to make MT more interested than ⑤ in his role in creation as a whole.

This may seem a far-fetched suggestion in the face of such a small difference. However, it does tally with more definite variations in the Nebuchadnezzar tradition elsewhere. In an MT plus at Jer 28/35.14 God promises that 'even the beasts of the field have I given to him (Nebuchadnezzar)' (**וְגַם אֶת־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה נָתַתִּי לוֹ**). The Septuagint stops at 'all the nations' (**πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν**). In the previous chapter the MT has another plus phrase, 'the people and the animals who are upon the face of the earth' (Jer 27/34.5, **אֶת־הָאָדָם וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ**). The placing

---

<sup>72</sup>It is the view of Müller, 'Mantische, Weisheit', 290, that the wisdom of Daniel in Susanna is different in kind from that conveyed by MT.

of **אֵל** makes it clear that the phrase is in the same grammatical relationship to the verb as **הָאָרֶץ** and so is an expansion of **הָאָרֶץ**. The Septuagint does not have this phrase which makes explicit that Nebuchadnezzar's dominion will also be over nature. It is closer to MT in the next verse but even there the syntax of **וְ** preserves the distinction between human and animal subjects. The Masoretic Text gives 'all these lands' (Jer 27/34.6, **כָּל-הָאֲרָצוֹת הָאֵלֶּה**) to Nebuchadnezzar as well as 'the beasts of the field' (**חַיֵּי הַשָּׂדֶה**) all of whom together are 'to serve him' (**לְעַבְדּוֹ**). Both beasts and lands function as the subject of the infinitive.<sup>73</sup> In contrast the Septuagint maintains a distinction by assigning separate verbs to each of 'the earth' and 'the beasts of the field'. The earth is 'to serve him' (*δουλεύειν αὐτῷ*) while the beasts are 'to work for him' (*ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτῷ*). The Septuagint approaches the issue in less universalistic and more nationalistic terms than is the case in MT. This same difference in tradition may well be hinted at in Daniel 2.38.

### differing historical backgrounds

Another variation likely to reflect a difference in historical traditions may be found in v 43.<sup>74</sup> In question is the significance of iron mixed with clay and the resultant fragility. According to the Masoretic Text this foreshadows a kingdom which will be mixed 'by the seed of men' (**בְּרֵעַ אֲנָשָׁא**) and the two parts will not 'cleave' (**רִבֵּק**) to one another. Theodotion preserves equivalence of elements in his translation of these phrases with *ἐν σπέρματι ἀνθρώπων* and a participial form of

---

<sup>73</sup>See the discussions of Jer 27/34 by Tov, 'Exegetical Notes', 84ff, and McKane, 98ff.

<sup>74</sup>The dating of chs 3 and 4 by **וְ** provided some clues as to the translator's intentions. In ch 2 the dates are identical so no help is forthcoming from that quarter. Even if the P967 reading of *δωδεκατω* (v 1, 'twelfth') instead of *δευτέρῳ* ('second') is correct, that in itself does not provide a clue, although it does create a parallel with the dating in Ju 1.1 and 2.1 which would be worth further investigation. The *δωδεκατω* reading provides a nice progression in chs 2-4, but does not tie events to a significant part of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in the way that 'the eighteenth year' (**וְ**, 3.1 and 4.4) does. Hamm, *Kap 1-2*, 140ff, considers the 88-Syh reading is a correction towards MT. See also Hartman and DiLella, 138, on the P967 dating.

προσκολλάω. The picture is most likely to be one of mixed marriage.<sup>75</sup> That is clearly what is meant by the mixing of seed in Ezra 9.2. The verb כִּנָּח, although unique here in Biblical Aramaic, is commonly used in Biblical Hebrew of marriage or loyalty within a binding relationship (for example Gen 2.24 and Ru 1.14). Commentators are divided over whether the use of כִּנָּח in v 43 reflects a particular historical relationship or a general policy of the mingling of nationalities within an empire.<sup>76</sup> Theodotion's translation indicates that he read it as a reference to a particular alliance through marriage. The Septuagint, however, renders the verse in less relational language. The mixture of iron and earthenware signifies the mingling of 'races of men' (γένεσιν ἀνθρώπων). The consequent weakness arises because they are not 'in harmony nor well-disposed to one another' (ὁμονοοῦντες οὔτε εὐνοοῦντες ἀλλήλοις). This phrase is more descriptive of relations between groups of people than of marriage.

The majority opinion is that MT represents political marriages between the Seleucids and Ptolemies, which of course were notably unsuccessful in bringing about harmony.<sup>77</sup> If that is the case, the events envisaged would have taken place in either 250 or 193 BCE.<sup>78</sup> Another view is that it refers to Alexander's policy of intermarriage with the Persians as a way of encouraging the conglomeration of races within the empire. This latter view allows for a late Persian provenance although the choice of relational vocabulary by MT makes this possible rather than probable. The former view reflects more accurately the spirit of disharmony within the empire that is crucial to Daniel's interpretation of the dream of the statue. At the same time it is a more likely explanation of the marriage imagery implied by MT.

---

<sup>75</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 36, says the phrase 'more naturally denotes intermarriage'.

<sup>76</sup>Porteous, 49f, takes issue with the interpretation of Montgomery, *Daniel*, 190, that the phrase represents Alexander's policy of 'the fusion of races and cultures'.

<sup>77</sup>See, for example, Delcor, *Daniel*, 86.

<sup>78</sup>Torrey, 'Notes', 248. But compare Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 77.

The question then arises as to what particular situation may be behind the interpretative translation on the part of ̔. Disharmony between races of people can be found in any era, and the most that can be said is that the Septuagint version of this chapter arose in a period when intermarriage was not a particular feature of troubled relationships between races. In that case, the problems the Seleucids had with Egypt and the Jews around the time of the Maccabean revolt could form the backdrop to ̔. Such a view is consistent with the Jewish reinterpretation of Nebuchadnezzar, possibly as a product of the struggles with Antiochus IV, already noted. It must be emphasized that the text of ̔ allows for this sort of provenance, but by no means requires it. It is however consistent with trends that have been noted in chs 3-6, and with the slightly more absolute understanding of what happens 'after these things' in ̔.

At the same time, whatever is chosen as the historical referent of **בזרע אנשא**, it almost certainly refers to events much earlier than mid second century, even if vv 40-43 are taken to have been subject to later amendment.<sup>79</sup> In its canonical setting it is part of an unmistakably Persian context, as a comparison of the use of administrative terms in MT and ̔ shows. In my discussion of ch 3 I suggested that the phrase 'high officials of the province' (3.2, **שלטי מדינתא**), rather than being a summary of the preceding items in the list, is a group of centralized officials, and that **מדינתא** is in fact a province within the wider Persian empire. The other officials function in the outlying provincial units. This terminology seems to be present also at the end of ch 2. Daniel becomes 'ruler over the whole province of Babylon' (v 48, **השלטה על כל-מדינת בבל**) as well as a 'chief prefect' (**רב-סגנין**) over the wise men. Both of these are terms reminiscent of chs 3 and 6 in particular. Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego have a slightly different function probably in a provincial unit of the empire.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup>For his part Torrey, 'Notes', 246, opines that the Aramaic vv 40-43 show no acquaintance with the Seleucids or Maccabees. But compare again Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 77.

<sup>80</sup>Jephet, 15, says the promotion of Daniel's companions is an 'introduction to the sequel'.

The Septuagint does not make these distinctions. It gives no particular title to the promoted Daniel, but instead makes the descriptive statement that Nebuchadnezzar 'set him up over the affairs of Babylon' (v 48, κατέστησεν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς Βαβυλωνίας). Similarly his function with respect to the wise men is described in general terms as 'ruler and leader' (ἄρχοντα καὶ ἡγούμενον), the same terms used of him in Ἔ ch 4 (4.18). Moreover no distinction is made between Daniel whom the king 'set up over the affairs of Babylon' (v 48, κατέστησεν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων Βαβυλωνίας), and his three companions who also 'were set up over the affairs of Babylon' (v 49, κατασταθῶσιν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς Βαβυλωνίας). Theodotion shows the same lack of awareness of the technical terms as Ἔ. This is apparent in v 48 where Ἔ calls Daniel a 'ruler of the satraps' (ἄρχοντα σατραπῶν) while MT terms him 'chief of the prefects' (רַב־סֻגִּי).

#### conclusion: links with Daniel 3-6

It is generally recognized that ch 2 is in some measure different from the other Aramaic stories about Daniel's relationships with his sovereigns. Often this is expressed as a consequence of its obvious links with the only vision of Daniel conveyed in Aramaic, ch 7. Lenglet's analysis of these two chapters as the outer pair in a chiasm has won widespread acceptance.<sup>81</sup> However he also notes that they are in contrast as much as in parallel.<sup>82</sup> The parallels with ch 7 will become apparent in the next chapter. The contrasts may be seen in that, as well as being set apart from chs 3-6, ch 2 has much in common with them and in some respects is in continuity with them. Much of the discussion of this chapter has pointed up that continuity in imagery, narrative technique, provenance and theology.

The nature of this relationship between chs 2 and chs 3-6 is debatable. Goldingay encapsulates the debate with the comment, 'it might

---

<sup>81</sup>The idiosyncratic structure offered by Gooding, 60ff, agrees with Lenglet on no other point than that chs 2 and 7 belong together.

<sup>82</sup>Lenglet, 180. See also Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 13ff, and Davies, *Daniel*, 44.

be that these chapters depend on chap. 2, but it is simpler to assume that chap. 2 was written in the light of those other chapters...'.<sup>83</sup> In fact, outside vv 13-23 and 40-43 there is little support for that assumption. Even in 40-43 opinions are divided over the type of date required by the application of the iron and earthenware imagery. The bulk of the chapter demonstrates a Persian setting which makes it contemporary with chs 3-6.<sup>84</sup> In literary terms, we have also seen how the ambiguities resident in the responses of Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar to the dream of the statue look forward to subsequent stories for their resolution. The assumption that ch 2 is later perhaps partly arises because it is a different genre from 3-6. It explores the difference between human and divine wisdom, whereas the succeeding chapters focus more on the temporal relationships between the king and his subjects who belong also to the Jewish faithful.<sup>85</sup> That does not mean it has to belong to a different era.

However, there is evidence that vv 13-23 do belong to a period closer to, although probably not concurrent with, the times reflected in ch 7 and the Septuagintal translations of 3-6.<sup>86</sup> As a result, the probable *Vorlage* of ⑤ had already been partly adjusted towards a Hellenistic setting, and the process of redefining the exilic Daniel stories to fit the later Jewish interest in cult and nation had begun.<sup>87</sup> That the adjustment is only partial is illustrated by the difference in focus between the song of vv 20-23 and the song of praise in the Greek

---

<sup>83</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 38

<sup>84</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 48, dates the original from the early years of Cyrus. McNamara, 149, notes the 'intense oriental colouring' of the traditions enshrined in Daniel 2-6 MT, which he attributes to its 'eastern origin'. See also Millard, 'Daniel 1-6', 73, on the 'high proportion of correct detail' in the court scenes in Daniel.

<sup>85</sup>Collins, 'Court-Tales', 222

<sup>86</sup>Anderson, 16

<sup>87</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 48, speaks of a shift from 'empirical...knowledge' to 'supernatural insight' brought about by the insertion of vv 20-23. Hammer, 26, notes the beginnings of 'the transcendent character of wisdom' characteristic of later wisdom. Gammie, 'Intention and Sources', 292, in the context of his discussion on the influence of Deutero-Isaiah on Daniel, sees in Daniel a link between wisdom and apocalyptic.



Additions in ch 3. Even so, it is not surprising that the result is a translation closer to the Aramaic in ch 2 than in chs 3-6. This means that many of the literary aspects of the Aramaic are also present in the Old Greek. At times the nature of such a translation even results in a relaxation of ̣'s vigilance in promoting monotheism and denying the divinity of kings. Nevertheless, it is still possible to detect in its translation of the older material of ch 2, characteristics in ̣ that are much more obvious in chs 3-6. The Septuagint's inability to translate the Persian / Babylonian backdrop is a case in point, as is its preference for κύριος and suspicion of the plural אלהים. The concern about a distinct Jewish community in hostile surroundings and the more nationalistic interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar also relates to the interest of ̣ in the Jewish cult and nation.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### DANIEL 7

There is a marked shift in genre between chs 6 and 7 in the Masoretic Text of Daniel. The interpreter becomes the dreamer, stories give way to visions, and the political concerns of earlier chapters are overtaken by the future orientation of apocalyptic.<sup>1</sup> It is also clear that ch 7 occupies a 'pivotal position' in the received form of the book of Daniel.<sup>2</sup> As well as looking forward to chs 8-12 in its introduction of the vision genre, it is also linked back to the stories of Jewish heroes in foreign courts. This is most obvious in its use of the Aramaic language, but there are a number of literary and thematic links with the stories that go far beyond the sharing of a common language. The focus of this chapter on Daniel 7 will be more on what has gone before that pivotal position than what is yet to come in the visions.

The first sight that meets the eye in that look backwards is Daniel 2, and my approach to Daniel 7 takes up where the discussion of Daniel 2 leaves off. We have seen that an adjustment towards a more Hellenistic setting and a shift in emphasis is evident in ch 2, particularly in vv 13-23. The process of redefining the exilic Daniel in terms of Jewish cult and nation has begun. The result in ch 2 was a 6 translation that reflected a *Vorlage* much closer to the Aramaic of MT than was the case in the other narratives. I suggested that at least vv 13-23 of Daniel 2

---

<sup>1</sup>Heaton, 186

<sup>2</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 58. See also Raabe, 271, and Rowley, 'The Unity of the Book of Daniel', 250. David, 97ff, treats ch 7 as the 'literary hinge' on which the book swings.

reflected a period closer to that behind Daniel 7 and the Septuagintal translations of chs 3-6 than the Persian setting evident elsewhere in the stories. Once we come to ch 7, with the exception of the transitional v 1 which sets Daniel's vision in the reign of Belshazzar, the Persian diaspora is not a factor. Interest is much more in the identity of the Jewish people as a nation and the threat to their nationhood and cult (v 24). The seer is most concerned about the fourth beast and particularly the extra horn, because he locates therein the immediate threat to the holy ones. These are concerns that we have also attributed to the Old Greek translator in chs 2-6, so it is not surprising that the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text are even closer to one another than was the case with Daniel 2.

As a result the bulk of the variations between MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  can be explained on technical grounds and do not entail a change in meaning between the versions. There are, however, still some differences that are noteworthy. To demonstrate this I compare the narrative structures of the two versions and especially their handling of the hidden personae behind the autobiographical account. In connection with that, a literary device linking the vision and its interpretation is also explored, and a possible difference in the way the two narrators view Daniel is noted. The greater part of this study, though, deals with issues of content and meaning. Variations that are best accounted for on technical grounds and do not entail a change in meaning between versions are enumerated first. I then centre the comparative work on the key figures of the son of man, the holy ones, and the four beasts, and on how the elements of vision and interpretation relate to one another. This leads in to the final part of the chapter, where I draw out the main literary and thematic links between ch 7 and the other Aramaic narratives. One area where there is a substantial difference between MT and  $\mathfrak{G}$  is in the way the versions give an overall structure to Dan 2-7, and that forms the final part of the discussion on links.

The vast secondary literature on this particular chapter of the Bible witnesses to the number and complexity of exegetical issues present in it. Many of them do not admit of easy solutions, as the literature amply demonstrates. The primary aim of this section of the thesis is not to solve all the exegetical problems. A full attempt to do so would

swamp the main purpose, which is to explore the interaction between the Aramaic and Greek from a narrative perspective. However, as a necessary backdrop to that, I begin with a summary of the issues surrounding the Ancient of Days, the son of man, the holy ones of the Most High, and the unity or otherwise of the chapter.<sup>3</sup> The last of those entails a close look at the place of vv 21-22 in the chapter. As v 13 is central to several of the questions, I am also compelled to consider the most likely Old Greek form of that verse in light of the evidence in P967. I state the position I take regarding these matters for the purpose of the ensuing discussion, but other issues are treated in detail only to the extent that they are germane to the particular perspective of this study.

### Ancient of Days in the Masoretic Text

A discussion of the Ancient of Days figure in Daniel 7 inevitably revolves around the source of the imagery in this puzzling chapter. It is beyond the scope of my present purposes to enter fully into that question.<sup>4</sup> Suffice to say that, whether or not the Ancient of Days can be identified with El or the Father of Years of Ugaritic literature, an aged deity is almost certainly in question here.<sup>5</sup> I adopt the view that, in whatever terms he may be described, the Ancient of Days is a figure representative of the God of Israel, and to be identified with the Most

---

<sup>3</sup>Since I follow the practice of capitalizing names for the deity, I shall capitalize Ancient of Days in line with my view that he is a divine figure. I leave son of man uncapitalized because I argue that the figure in Dan 7.13 is primarily human.

<sup>4</sup>See, for example, Emerton, 225ff, and Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 100ff, on the Canaanite origins. Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, 74, has been influential with his view that an enthronement ritual along the lines of Ps 2 is a source. Reid, 87, who sees an amalgam of sources, backs several horses. He alerts us to the danger of putting Canaanite and OT background in opposition to one another. Lucas, 'Animal Imagery', 184, tends to do so and is in danger of caricaturing Emerton's position. Mosca, 500ff, argues that biblical material is the 'missing link' between Ugarit and Daniel 7. But see also the skeptical note on Canaanite origins sounded by Ferch, 79ff.

<sup>5</sup>Emerton, 230. Delcor, 'Sources', 302, considers the Ancient of Days equates with the 'father of years' in Ugaritic. See also Pope, 32, who is not so sure. Oldenburg, 17ff, and Wyatt, 447, dissent.

High who appears elsewhere in ch 7.<sup>6</sup> As will become clearer later in this discussion, the relationship of the Ancient of Days to the son of man is therefore analogous to the relationship between the Most High and the holy ones.

### son of man in the Masoretic Text

It is more difficult to describe any sort of consensus on the figure of the son of man (v 13). What is generally agreed is that the indefinite Aramaic expression, **בֶּר אַש**, normally speaks of a human being.<sup>7</sup> Even in Biblical Hebrew this is the case where God commonly addresses Ezekiel as 'son of man' (**בֶּן-אָדָם**, Ez 2.1; 37.11; 38.2 and 14; 39.1 and 17). Some would also argue that Ps 80.18 reflects a tradition that uses the son of man as a collective term for Israel.<sup>8</sup> However, a human likeness is sometimes used in Ezekiel to depict a different sort of presence, although the exact expression is slightly different. The prophet saw one with 'an appearance like the form of a man' (Ez 1.26, **דְּמוּת כְּמֹדָה אָדָם**). The vocabulary chosen explicitly links this personage with 'the form of the appearance of the glory of the Lord' (Ez 1.28, **מֹדָה דְּמוּת כְּבוֹד-יְהוָה**). Some would argue that the prefix **כ** before **אַש** alerts us to the possibility that such is the case in Daniel 7 also.<sup>9</sup> The equation is not quite so clear in Ezekiel 8. There it seems more as though the one with 'the appearance like the form of a man' (Ez 8.2, **דְּמוּת כְּמֹדָה-אָש**) is a heavenly messenger sent to bring Ezekiel into the

---

<sup>6</sup>Keil, 230, expresses it thus: Daniel sees 'an old man, or a man of grey hairs, in whose majestic form God makes Himself visible'. See also Slotki, 58, and Driver, 85, although Emerton, 230, takes issue with Driver's use of 1 Enoch 14.18-22. But note the view of Jepheth, 35, that the Ancient of Days is a judging angel. Other medieval Jewish commentators were divided. For Rashi he was God but for Ibn-Ezra he was Michael. See Gallé, 74.

<sup>7</sup>See Vermes, 'Appendix E', 327. Usages in earlier and later non-biblical Aramaic are expounded by Fitzmyer in *Sefire*, 99, and *Genesis Apocryphon*, 60. An example of the indefinite use from Ugarit is found in ll 14f of Ras Ibn Hani 78/20 where *l'adam* is in parallel with *lbn 'adam*. See de Moor, 430.

<sup>8</sup>Russell, 340. Hooker, 13, also asserts that that is the case.

<sup>9</sup>For example Feuillet, 184, and Young, *Daniel's Vision*, 20.

presence of God. The information that his bodily parts only take the form of bodily parts (Ez 8.2f) emphasizes that the figure only looks like a man. In the Hebrew portions of Daniel, a similar form of expression appears in 10.16 and 18. Somebody with 'the form of sons of men' (10.16, כְּדִמוֹת בְּנֵי אָדָם) approaches Daniel and somebody with 'the appearance of a man' (10.18, כְּמֵדָאָה אָדָם) touches him.

The ambiguous use of the expression within Ezekiel and the Psalms sums up in broad outline the views that have been taken on the son of man in Daniel 7.<sup>10</sup> He is either a human figure who functions as a symbol for the saints, or he is an angelic or ancient mythical figure, or he is divine or messianic.<sup>11</sup> After a lengthy review of the options, Montgomery opts for the son of man as symbol and in doing so cites 'the Semitic genius to personify the people'.<sup>12</sup> When it comes to a comparison of the versions, I will have more to say on this question, but broadly I see the son of man in the Masoretic Text as symbolic of a temporal reality.

Following from there, v 14 seems to depict a process whereby the son of man acquires a divine authority.<sup>13</sup> While his authority is derived (יְהִיב), the service offered him is the same sort that is due to divinity. This is portrayed by פָּלַח, the same word used in the confrontation between the king and the young men of ch 3 over whose God should be served (3.12,

---

<sup>10</sup>Note within 1 Enoch a similar variation between chs 46f, where the son of man appears to be a heavenly or angelic figure, and ch 60, where Enoch himself is addressed as Son of Man.

<sup>11</sup>See the summaries of Feuillet, 191, and Montgomery, *Daniel*, 317. Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 142ff, sees Dan 7 entirely in terms of a heavenly battle where the son of man is the archangel Michael and the holy ones have angelic counterparts. See also Coppens and Dequeker, 50 and 67. Zevit, 395, prefers Gabriel. For Davies, *Daniel*, 102 and 104f, the holy ones are Israel while the son of man is a collective referent. Delcor, 'Sources', 312, sees the son of man as symbol. See also Hooker, 28, and Casey, *Son of Man*, 25. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 177, steers a middle course with the comment that the ambiguity is perhaps deliberate.

<sup>12</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 323. As long ago as the third century CE Porphyry, as cited in Casey, 'Porphyry', 21, saw the son of man in this light.

<sup>13</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 111, and Delcor, *Daniel*, 156. This process may also be thought of in the Canaanite terms of enthronement by the aged deity. See Emerton, 242.



14, 17, 18 and 28).<sup>14</sup> In ch 6 (6.17 and 21) Darius describes Daniel's relationship with God in terms of *פלח*. The process has perhaps been duplicated in 4 Esdras 13, where a human figure (4 Esdr 13.3, 'this man', *ille homo*) comes out of the depths of the sea 'with the clouds of heaven' (4 Esdr 13.3, *cum nubibus caeli*).<sup>15</sup> That figure is later described as a man whom the Most High 'had kept' (4 Esdr 13.25f, *conseruat*) for the work of deliverance. At this stage he is implicitly identified with the creator God by the phrase 'his creation' (*creaturam suam*), yet is still distinct from the Most High.<sup>16</sup> Since the Most High is speaking the interpretation, *suam* can only refer to the being who has arrived with the clouds of heaven. Later still he is revealed to be the son of the Most High (4 Esdr 13.52, *filium meum*).<sup>17</sup> But in both Daniel 7 and 4 Esdras 13 it remains an open question whether or not the son of man's authority becomes intrinsic or remains derived.

### holy ones of the Most High in the Masoretic Text

There are complex textual and translational issues linked to the question of who the holy ones might be. These are treated in more detail later, but a summary of opinions as well as a statement of which interpretation of MT I prefer is helpful at this early stage. As was the case for the son of man, commentators opt broadly for three types of understanding. These holy ones can be angelic figures, or the earthly people of Israel.<sup>18</sup> A third intermediate possibility is that they are an earthly people who somehow become heavenly beings. The 'wise' (12.3, *משכילים*) are perhaps considered in those terms when Dan 12.3 states that

---

<sup>14</sup>Despite the comments of Driver, 88.

<sup>15</sup>Beale, *The Use of Daniel*, 141, considers the picture to be an amalgam of the imagery in Dan 7.2f and 13a.

<sup>16</sup>Bensly (ed), 'The Fourth Book of Ezra'

<sup>17</sup>Delcor, 'Sources', 305, notes that the clouds in 4 Esdr 13 seem to provide transport from earth to heaven for a terrestrial being. He uses this as an argument that the son of man is a human figure. Contrast Feuillet, 188, who argues for a messiah figure prefigured in the Old Testament.

<sup>18</sup>For a helpfully brief summary of the arguments each way, see Poythress, 209.

they 'will shine...like the stars forever and ever' (יִזְדָּרִי...כְּכֹכְבִּים לְעוֹלָם וְעַד). An important proponent of the angelic view has been Noth, who understands the עַם in the phrase, 'people of the holy ones of the most high' (v 27, עַם קְדִישֵׁי עֲלִיוֹן) as 'host'.<sup>19</sup> While his understanding of עַם has not prevailed, there remains a substantial body of opinion who see the holy ones as heavenly figures.<sup>20</sup> Others are equally insistent that a group of humans is intended, sometimes using the same data as their opponents.<sup>21</sup> Collins provides an example of one variety of the intermediate view, whereby the referent of the holy ones is human, but in the context of v 27 they are represented by angelic counterparts in a heavenly battle.<sup>22</sup> I accept Brekelmans' argument that the understanding of קְדִישֵׁי must be decided by context. In 4.11 the 'holy one' is in apposition to 'the watcher' (עֵיר), whereas in ch 7 'the holy ones' are best understood in temporal terms. That understanding of MT lies behind my treatment of the versions of ch 7.<sup>23</sup>

However the view of Collins and others who wish to see the whole chapter as the enactment of a heavenly battle, raises an important point

---

<sup>19</sup>'Schar', according to Noth, 285 and 287. That view depends on vv 20-22 being secondary. See the counter-argument of Brekelmans, 329.

<sup>20</sup>Dequeker, 135-173, argues exhaustively from the Qumran texts that the holy ones are angelic. See also Reid, 89. For example 11QMelch, 1 9, explicitly interprets קְדִישֵׁי אֵל as gods, and עֲנָנִים at 1 11f are said to refer to Satan and the spirits of 'his lot' (גִּדְּלוֹ). See Milik, 'Milki-sedeq', 98f, and Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 301. Davies, *IQM*, 102, reads the same term in *IQM* 12.9 and says it means 'angels', but Goldingay, *Daniel*, 177, would not agree.

<sup>21</sup>See Brekelmans, 319ff, who differs from Dequeker in his handling of the Qumran material. He says the issue must be decided on context, and the present context requires a human referent. See also Davies, *Daniel*, 104, Casey, *Son of Man*, 44, and Hasel, 186ff. For Saadia and Rashi, in Gallé, 81, Israel is represented in v 18. Beasley-Murray, 52f, points to עַם-קְדִישִׁים in 8.24 where he says the referent is also human.

<sup>22</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 126 and 142ff

<sup>23</sup>See Vermes, 'Qumran Forum', 302f, for his translation and comment on Qumran fragment 4Q246. There 'the people of God' (1 4, עַם אֵל) receive an 'eternal kingdom' (1 5, מַלְכוּת עוֹלָם) and their dominion an 'eternal dominion' (1 9, שְׁלֹטֵן עוֹלָם). Vermes says this 'may constitute the earliest non-biblical evidence for the collective understanding of "one like a son of man"'.

about the function of symbolism in the vision of Daniel 7.<sup>24</sup> For Collins 'angels are not symbols but real beings' so 'it is unthinkable that humans would be symbolized by angels, or depicted in language which is normally understood to refer to heavenly beings.'<sup>25</sup> Therefore visions are not so much interpretations of ongoing temporal events as a transformation of the present existence. According to Davies, this approach does not tally with the interpretation of the visionary beasts and horns and so does not work for an understanding either of the son of man or of the holy ones of the Most High.<sup>26</sup> Rather, visions provide a glimpse into the interaction of the human and the divine, the temporal and the eternal.<sup>27</sup> The interpretation therefore must be to some extent about temporal realities, while also transcending them.<sup>28</sup> Such was the case in both chs 2 and 4, and to a lesser extent may be applied to the interaction between 'mystery' (רִיז) and 'interpretation' (פִּשְׁרָא) in ch 5. That understanding of the link between vision and interpretation, as a meeting of the divine with the temporal and human, is also presupposed in my comparison of MT and 6 in ch 7.

#### Daniel 7: coherent and consistent?

The above mentioned link between vision and interpretation is part

---

<sup>24</sup>Note also the thesis of Barker, *The Great Angel*, 29 and 38, that the holy ones are angel figures and the deity in the Aramaic chapters is Elyon, the ancient High God. The unnamed son of man is in fact the Holy One, Yahweh.

<sup>25</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 140f

<sup>26</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 103f. He disagrees with Collins position, which he says is that 'visions...portray both earthly and heavenly realities as two dimensions of the same reality'.

<sup>27</sup>For Goldingay, *Daniel*, 177, the ambiguity of the holy ones contributes to this effect. Lacocque, *Daniel in his Time*, 145ff, speaks of the tension between chaos and cosmos. For him the genius of the son of man image is that it combines eschatological vision with mythical time. Caird, 264, speaks of the fluctuation between temporal and transcendental in apocalyptic.

<sup>28</sup>See the discussion of Sherriffs, 39, on hermeneutical approaches to eschatology. In the context of a comparison of Zionist and Babylonian nationalism, he calls this approach 'contextualist' and prefers it over 'reductionist' and 'literalist' understandings.

of the wider question of whether or not Daniel 7 in its present form is a 'coherent and consistent account', in terms of both narrative structure and deployment of symbolism.<sup>29</sup> The chief stumbling block for those who see a literary and logical unity in Daniel 7 lies in the relationship between interpretation and vision, and in particular the problematic vv 21f. These verses provide a challenge to most attempts at a commentary on Daniel 7, and the present one is no exception. The problem is easier to deal with for those who discern the overlapping of several visions in Daniel 7. The material in vv 21f is then simply evidence of a seam in the process of redaction.<sup>30</sup>

Problems with vv 21f are particularly acute for those who perceive the chapter's unity to be partly in some sort of equivalence, however that may be defined, between the son of man in the vision and the holy ones in the interpretation. Because Daniel is the speaker, the reader expects to hear about the vision already outlined. The conventional 'I looked' (v 21, *חזוה הויה*) reminds the reader of Daniel's earlier speech which interspersed the telling of the vision with such expressions.<sup>31</sup> It is then a surprise to hear from his mouth new details of the vision. In the original account of the vision there is no mention of war being made on God's people before the court of the Ancient of Days convenes. The only objects of the final horn's aggression are the horns that it uproots (v 8), which are probably themselves either pagan kingdoms or kings of the same kingdom from which the boastful horn springs. V 22 also makes a more explicit link between the judgement scene and the handing over of eternal sovereignty to the holy ones of the Most High, than does the first telling of the vision. In the earlier account the result of judgement seems to be condemnation of the fourth beast, a stay of execution for its three predecessors (vv 11f), and the eventual granting of eternal sovereignty to the son of man (v 14). The holy ones of the

---

<sup>29</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 29

<sup>30</sup>In addition to Noth, the view that vv 21-22 are secondary is found in a variety of commentators. See for example Porteous, 113, Plöger, 115, Dequeker, 127, and Bickerman, 108. Hartman and DiLella, 210, consider as additional all material relating to the eleventh horn.

<sup>31</sup>Raabe, 268

Most High do not feature as beneficiaries at all. If the holy ones are in the vision of Daniel prior to the advent of the son of man, how can they also be an interpretation of the son of man?

At the same time, the contents of Daniel's speech seems to contain the beginnings of interpretation. The final phrase of v 22, 'and the holy ones took possession of the kingdom' (וּמַלְכוּתָא הִחֲסֵנוּ קְדִישִׁין), recalls the words of interpretation in v 18. The choice of חֲסֵן here and in v 18 is slightly at odds with the emphasis elsewhere in ch 7. The suggestion is of aggressive military action by the holy ones in gaining the kingdom.<sup>32</sup> Otherwise the choice of vocabulary makes it clear that the holy ones as well as the son of man receive what is given them.<sup>33</sup> Each time a phrase containing חֲסֵן appears, it is linked to some sort of reference to the heavenly origins of their possession. Perhaps then the use of חֲסֵן implies a look forward to the means by which celestial intent is to be implemented. At the same time v 22 anticipates the expansion in vv 25-27. This is the one time in ch 7 when the distinction between vision and interpretation, or seer and interpreter, is blurred.

For all that, there is a strong body of opinion arguing for the integrity of the chapter.<sup>34</sup> Without denying a possible redactional history, ch 7 may substantially be understood as a coherent narrative about a vision and the interpretation that is given to Daniel. With particular reference to vv 21f, Daniel's later expansion of the vision can be appreciated in literary terms.<sup>35</sup> The technique of leaving lacunae in the accounts that are only later filled in, is one that we have seen

---

<sup>32</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 45, notes that military action is not ruled out.

<sup>33</sup>This supposes the most likely meaning of דִּינָא יְהִי לְקְדִישִׁי to be 'he gave judgement for / in favour of the holy ones...'. See Driver, 91.

<sup>34</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 27, and Hooker, 24ff, agree on the coherence but differ on other matters. See also Anderson, 76, and Hasel, 189. Beasley-Murray, 45, speaks of 'a vision in two acts'. Niditch, 194, holds the integrity of the chapter together with its anthological nature, not altogether convincingly. Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 129, and Delcor, 'Sources', 290, both link their views to the mythological background of ch 7.

<sup>35</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 27ff, makes a particularly strong case for this.

before.<sup>36</sup> In effect, the gap between the accession of the final horn and its final destruction (vv 8-11) corresponds to the gap in the summary interpretation between the rise of the four kings and the reception of the kingdom by the holy ones (vv 17f). What occurred in the silence is eventually revealed at vv 21f as a war on the holy ones and action taken by them which leads to their receiving eternal sovereignty. The verb ןִּסְּ noted above is a further indication of this process.

The question of consistency may also be approached in terms of the nature of the relationship between the son of man and the holy ones of the Most High. Hooker and Casey both demonstrate this approach. While they differ over the exact nature of the link, for both of them the material in vv 21f is an important part of their explanation of it.<sup>37</sup> Each in their own way needs vv 21f to be at the point in the chapter where it is. I accept the argument that Daniel 7 is a coherent and consistence account, largely on the literary and symbolic grounds offered by Casey, and assume that to be the case in what follows. At the same time, the huge corpus of divergent secondary material on Daniel 7 alerts me to the caution required in handling such ambivalent texts.

#### narrative structure

The narrative structure of ch 7 is more complex than it at first appears. It is more than a simple account by Daniel of a vision seen and an interpretation obtained. The narrative belongs to several personae. The third person narrator of v 1 quickly gives way to Daniel's recounting of his vision.<sup>38</sup> Then the bystander of whom Daniel requests an interpretation takes up the telling, briefly in vv 17f and more fully in vv 23-27. Finally Daniel himself, speaking in the first person, closes the account. The bystander or interpreter exists only within the

---

<sup>36</sup>Note again the comment of Eissfeldt, 112, on variation between message and interpretation as a stylistic feature.

<sup>37</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 39, insists that the son of man is 'a pure symbol'. For him this makes impossible the views of Hooker, 13ff, on the suffering son of man as equivalent to the suffering holy ones.

<sup>38</sup>Charles, *Daniel*, 173, notes a similar phenomenon in 1 Enoch 1.1 and 3, and 92.1.



framework of Daniel's story.

Behind these personae are certain implied personalities. While he is recounting the initial vision (vv 2-14), Daniel intersperses his speech with the formulae 'I looked and behold...' (vv 2, 6, 7 and 13, *וַחֲזָה הָיִיתָ וְאָרָו*), 'I looked until...' (vv 4, 9 and 11, *וַחֲזָה הָיִיתָ עַד דִּי*), or simply 'and behold...' (vv 5 and 8, *וְאָרָו*).<sup>39</sup> As a variation, when he expands on the activities of the little horn he also breaks his narration with 'I looked' (v 21, *וַחֲזָה הָיִיתָ*).<sup>40</sup> These interjections ensure that the person of Daniel in the story is not eclipsed entirely by the vision itself. At the same time they point the reader outside his speech to an implied listener. It is not clear whether the listener is the narrator of v 1, or an audience completely outside the narrative.

Furthermore a feature of the Aramaic syntax of vv 4-13 is the number of verbs in the peil conjugation and also in the causative haphel form, which gives rise to a sense that another presence is at work behind the scenes.<sup>41</sup> The wings of the first beast were 'plucked out' (v 4, *מִדִּישָׁו*), and it was 'raised up' (v 4, *וְנִשְׁלַח*) and 'caused to stand' (v 4, *וְהִקְיַמָּה*) like a man before the heart of a man 'was given' (v 4, *וְיָדִיב*) to it. Rule 'was given' (v 6, *וְיָדִיב*) to the third beast. Later in the vision thrones 'were placed' (v 9, *וְרַמְיוֹ*) and books 'were opened' (v 10, *וּפְתִיחוּ*). The culmination of the judgement scene is that the fourth beast 'was killed' (v 11, *וְקָטְלָהּ*) and its body 'destroyed' (v 11, *וְהִוָּבַר*) and 'given' (v 11, *וְיָדִיבָהּ*) over to burning. Finally, the sovereignty of the first three beasts 'was taken away' (v 12, *וְהָעֲדִיּוֹ*) although an extension of life 'was given' (v 12, *וְיָדִיבָהּ*) them for a period of time. This cluster of peils and haphels to express the passive is a deliberate literary effect, intended to hint at a presence outside the scene but in some way

---

<sup>39</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 59, considers v 8 to be secondary partly because of the spelling of *אלו*. Casey, *Son of Man*, 13, argues that the spelling variation is insignificant.

<sup>40</sup>See the parallels drawn by Delcor, *Daniel*, 143, with 2.31 and 4.7 and 10.

<sup>41</sup>In the expression used by Auerbach, 11, the narrative is 'fraught with background'.

responsible for it.<sup>42</sup> It foreshadows the revelation of divine activity in the interpretation of the vision.

Outside of Daniel the peil form is rarely found in extant Aramaic writings, and when it does occur it is normally employed in an impersonal rather than a passive sense.<sup>43</sup> Even in Daniel the passive is normally expressed either with the third person impersonal construction or by the hithpaal. The former is instanced in vv 25 and 26 of the present chapter (יהבון and יהערון) as well as on a number of occasions in the other stories of Daniel (2.13 and 18; 3.21; 4.22 and 29). The hithpaal is pressed into service as a passive at 7.8; 2.34; 3.6, 11, 15 and 29; 4.30; 5.12; and 6.8 and 13. When the peil form features in the book of Daniel it does so in a setting of divine activity and appears to be a deliberate usage. Apart from vv 4-13 there are two other occasions in Daniel where peils occur in a cluster (2.19, 21 and 30; and 5.21-30), and there also it is clear that divine agency is intended to be understood behind the verb forms chosen. In ch 5 the queen reminds her audience that Nebuchadnezzar 'was driven away' (5.21, שרד). Because of Belshazzar's ignorance of these things, a hand 'was sent' (5.24, שלח) and a message 'was inscribed' (5.25, רשם).<sup>44</sup> The theme of God's election of sovereigns is also reinforced by Daniel's interpretative statement that Belshazzar's kingdom 'was given' (5.28, יהיבה) to the Persians. Later, the mystery surrounding the fate of Belshazzar is heightened by the storyteller's choice of קטל in 5.30. The use of peil in ch 2 involves the verb גלה, which was discussed at some length in a previous chapter. The secret of the king's vision 'was revealed' (2.19 and 30, גל) to Daniel.

---

<sup>42</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 164

<sup>43</sup>See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 190, and Gibson, 131 and 134, both of whose examples are of the impersonal use. Occurrences in Ezra (4.18 and 23; 5.7 and 14; 6.2) are also impersonal rather than passive. See Bauer and Leander, 93 and 104. Milik, 'Les Modèles Araméens', 361f, has recently identified a possible peil passive in 4QprEsthar-f, 1 2. Dalman, 202, notes only two or three exceptional instances in JPA literature. Stevenson, 44f, says the passive in JPA is almost always expressed by forms using the *ith* prefix.

<sup>44</sup>BDB lists שלח as a peal passive participle, and so the form is exceptional to the present discussion. Nevertheless it functions in the same way as the finite forms of the peil that we have been looking at.

Daniel 7 is as much a story about a man who saw a vision and its interpretation, as a report of the vision and the interpretation given.<sup>45</sup> As well as the constant interaction with the reader already noted in Daniel's use of formulae, the links between episodes make the chapter a narrative rather than a simple report. These links are in vv 15f, 19-22, and 28. Their focus on the feelings and thoughts of the first person narrator are characteristic of a story. Moreover, the culmination of the story is not so much that the kingdom of the Most High will last forever, as that Daniel has been frightened by what he saw to the extent that his 'colours changed' (v 28, **וְיִי שֶׁחָנָן**).

Some have suggested that phrases in the first and last verses contain a formal title and conclusion for the narrative. 'The main point' (v 1, **רָאִשׁ מִלִּין**) is an opening and 'the end of the matter' (v 28, **סוּפָא דִּי-מִלְחָא**) is the corresponding close.<sup>46</sup> The principal problem with this suggestion is that the first verse contains the words of the narrator while the last verse is spoken by Daniel himself. It is more likely that v 1 in the third person is simply a device to introduce the change of perspective in ch 7.<sup>47</sup> Verse 28 is not so much a convention of the genre as part of the comparison of Daniel the visionary with his royal counterparts.<sup>48</sup> This becomes more obvious when links between ch 7 and the stories are discussed.

Effectively the narrative belongs to Daniel, in the same way that the story of ch 4 belongs to Nebuchadnezzar. The chief difference is that the block of third person material in ch 4 means that the narrator at least retains a foothold in that story whereas he drops out entirely

---

<sup>45</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 8

<sup>46</sup>For example Montgomery, *Daniel*, 284.

<sup>47</sup>Miller, 116, sees 7.1 as a central clue to the redaction history of the book of Daniel. The fact that **וְיִי** is found only here in ch 7 forms part of his argument. Lacocque, *Daniel in his Time*, 132, also notes the shift from 'dream' to 'vision' between 'Daniel A and B'.

<sup>48</sup>Hartman and DiLella, 220, see the contents of v 28 entirely in terms of genre.

in ch 7. That foothold is not necessary as the first person of Daniel in ch 7 conveys the narrator's point of view, whereas the first person of Nebuchadnezzar in ch 4 cannot be relied upon to do so. The form of autobiographical narration shared by chs 4 and 7 also results in a similarity in the way the dialogue is managed, and unseen figures are hinted at. These aspects have been more fully discussed in relation to Daniel 4.

In broad outlines the narrative takes the same shape in the Septuagint. The opening phrase in v 23 is problematic in that it could be introducing indirect rather than direct speech. However the probability is that the *ὅτι* is a *ὅτι* recitative preceded by a summarizing statement in anticipation of what is to follow. *Θ* also uses *ὅτι* in this way in ch 2 (2.5, 10 and 25), whether or not there is an equivalent element in the Aramaic. The chief narrative difference is that the distinction between reflexive and passive that we have considered in some detail above is not available to the Greek translator. The passive form is much more readily used in Greek than Aramaic, and often represents the reflexive forms in Aramaic.<sup>49</sup> That means that it cannot so easily distinguish the *peil* form when it occurs. In the narrative presently under scrutiny, the *peil* is invariably represented in the Greek by an aorist passive. The same form is also often used to render a *haphel* (7.4) or a *hithpaal* (7.8; 2.9 and 34; 5.23, for example). Often the Septuagint represents the impersonal third person literally, even though the passive is intended, but sometimes this construction is also translated with an aorist passive (3.21). As a result, the foreshadowing effect of the Aramaic passive is also present in *Θ* vv 4-13, but is not as striking. This is partly because the link with other *peil* clusters in chs 2 and 5 as indicators of divine activity is not able to be made in the Greek.

In connection with that point, it is not clear who the speaker of the direct speech is in v 5. In MT the bear is commanded by the outside presence with the impersonal third person plural, *אָמַר*. The *Θ* equivalent is 'it / he spoke thus:' (v 5, *οὕτως εἶπεν*). This can

---

<sup>49</sup>Black, 126ff

possibly be explained as an attempt to represent the Aramaic impersonal. Against that,  $\Theta$  is normally accurate about the person of the verb in such a situation. See for example προσήγαγον (P967, v 13) and ἀποστελοῦσί (4.25). Moreover לָהּ in MT means that the bear-like creature is explicitly the object of the command. The absence of any object in  $\Theta$  suggests that 'it' is the subject of the verb in the Greek. Putting aside the problem of whom the Septuagint thinks the the second beast might be addressing, the Greek phrase οὕτως εἶπεν is a further dilution of the effect of the passives observable in Aramaic.

### a further literary note

There is an intriguing interplay of tense in this chapter, particularly relating to the son of man and the holy ones of the Most High. After the son of man approached the Ancient of Days, authority 'was given' (v 14,  $\text{דיב}$ ) to him. The verb is in the perfect tense, in common with the rest of the preceding account of a vision. Yet the outworkings of this encounter are expressed in the imperfect ( $\text{יפלותין}$ ,  $\text{יעדה}$  and  $\text{תתחבל}$ ). At this point the vision transcends the narrative form of a vision account and begins to tell of events that are yet to be. Something different happens during the interpretation of the vision, which largely adopts the imperfect tense. Yet the perfect appears at the beginning of v 27 where the kingdom 'is / was given' ( $\text{דיבנת}$ ) to the people.<sup>50</sup> The imperfect returns in a description of the resulting homage that will come to the saints.<sup>51</sup>

While the imperfect of v 14b is exceptional in the telling of the vision, the perfect of v 27 is exceptional in the interpretation. The literary effect is that the verbal structures of vv 14 and 27 are in

---

<sup>50</sup>The feminine singular form must be governed by  $\text{מלכותה}$  as the main subject, with the subsequent nouns in a type of parentheses formed by a  $\text{ו}$  explicative. Rosenthal, 56, cites  $\text{דיבנת}$  as an example of the perfect indicating the future, but gives no other examples of the phenomenon. His comment does not take account of the literary context.

<sup>51</sup>This interplay between the perfect and the imperfect is a characteristic also of New Testament eschatology. See for example 1 Pet 4.7, where a future orientation is expressed with the aorist ἡγγικεν, and in the Gospels see Mt 10.7.

parallel to one another. This serves as a further literary indicator that the giving of the kingdom to the people of the saints is linked to its reception by the son of man in the vision. This parallel is also present in the Septuagint, although the passive **היבת** (v 27) equates to an aorist active in **Θ** (ἔδωκε).

### the character of Daniel

Related to the point of ch 7 as narration is the portrayal of the character of Daniel in the narrative. There seems to be some difference in how the versions depict the effect of the vision on Daniel. The Masoretic Text description is bipartite, referring to 'spirit' (v 15, **רוח**) and 'sheath' (**גדרה**).<sup>52</sup> Daniel's spirit was 'troubled' (v 15, **אתכריח**) and the visions 'frightened (me)' (v 15, **יבהלני**) him. This separation of the mental and the physical continues in MT v 28. The Masoretic Text first records Daniel's mental state, that of intensified fear (v 28, **שגיא**), and then describes the physical manifestation: 'my colours changed upon me' (**זיזי ישמעון עלי**). Whatever effect is being described, it is the same one observable in the person of Belshazzar (5.9).

The Septuagint gathers both concepts into the phrase 'I Daniel' (v 15, ἐγὼ Δανιήλ), and then translates in a manner that focuses on his mental and emotional state. Daniel in **Θ** describes himself as ἀκηδυσίας. This can hardly mean 'heedless / uncaring' in the present context, and is more likely to denote exhaustion. If the producer of **Θ** is translating MT's **בהל** at this point, he is doing so with some freedom. The same freedom is evident at v 28 where Daniel, according to **Θ**, confesses that σφόδρα ἐκστάσει περιειχόμεν. Again, the exact meaning of the phrase is open to debate, but in general terms it denotes considerable mental turmoil. The following phrase, 'my state of mind altered me' (v 28, ἡ ἔξις μου διήνεγκεν ἐμοί), is in apposition, and clarifies what precedes

---

<sup>52</sup>The problems raised by **גדרה**, 'sheath', in v 15 are beyond the scope of the present discussion. But note the full comment of Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 78, on the word as used in The Genesis Apocryphon II.10. See also Driver, 89. The sheath seems to be a metaphor for the body as a receptacle for the soul or life force, and that is how I understand it in the present context. San 108a and Bereshith Rabba 26.6 also use the word to mean the body as distinct from the soul.



it. This is different from MT, where the physical effect is described as the result of Daniel's fear.

Particularly in v 28, the divergence results in a more emphatic description by Θ of Daniel as visionary. Several strong words in close proximity to one another alert the reader to this emphasis. Each one can sometimes carry the ordinary sense of its Aramaic equivalent, but taken together they have a cumulative effect. Firstly, ἕως καταστροφῆς ('until the conclusion') is a possible rendering of ܠܡܝܬܐ, but it is unusual. And σφόδρα ἐκστάσει ('great distraction') is not an exact rendering of the Aramaic, as we have noted above. The Septuagint nowhere else uses καταστροφή as a translation of ܠܡܝܬܐ. That Aramaic word, like its Hebrew namesake, can have an eschatological sense with implications of divine activity, but it can be understood in purely physical or political terms. Both uses occur in Daniel. Its physical sense is in 4.8 and 19, where the tree could be seen 'to the end of the earth' (לְסוֹף (כָּל-) אֲרֶעָא). It is used in a more eschatological manner in 6.27 where God's rule is said by Darius to last 'until the end' (עַד-ܠܡܝܬܐ). This range is representative of the semantic range of the word in Biblical Hebrew also. Theodotion's choice of either τέλος (6.27) or πέρας (4.11 and 22) roughly reflects that range. Καταστροφή, however, is much more redolent of human consequences of divine activity. In Sirach, NEB translates it as 'fate' (Sir 9.11 and 18.12). In Job, the Septuagint uses it to represent שׂוֹד (Jb 15.21, 'destroyer') or אָוֶן (Job 21.17, 'calamity'). It is also used in Proverbs to denote אָוֶן (Pr 1.27).

The eschatological nuances of καταστροφή are epitomized by the Septuagint's attempt to capture in Greek the sense of the metaphorical language of MT Hos 8.7a, 'for they will sow the wind and reap the whirlwind'. The Old Greek makes no attempt to reproduce the imagery of the second half of the line, ܠܡܝܬܐ ܕܝܫܪܐ. Instead it gives the interpretation, ἡ καταστροφή αὐτῶν ἐκδέχεται. The word used there for 'whirlwind' (ܠܡܝܬܐ) is interpreted by Θ with καταστροφή. The most literal sense of καταστροφή is 'turning against' and by extension that came to mean some sort of destructive event. By a further extension of meaning, that event could be thought of as the final end. It is not certain whether the two words סוֹף ('end') and ܠܡܝܬܐ ('whirlwind') are etymologically related, but the translator perceives them to be so.

Hence his assumption that the whirlwind has as its referent 'the end'. He chooses καταστροφή as a rendering of the image which captures the eschatological overtones of the Hebrew as he sees it. With such a tradition behind it, the word καταστροφή is used by the translator of Daniel 7 to interpret סופא in an eschatological direction.<sup>53</sup>

This effect is reinforced by the description of Daniel as subjected to σφόδρα ἐκστάσει. The Septuagint translates a number of different words with ἔκστασις, all of which denote some sort of turmoil or fear. Unlike its English derivative, it does not normally denote derangement. Nevertheless, despite the range of usage in translation, it is generally selected by Θ in the context of fear or confusion or panic generated in response to the activity of the Lord. Examples may be cited from Dt 28.28 (translating תמהון), 1 Ki 11.7 (translating פחד), and 2 Chr 29.8 (translating זוע). Also significant to its use as an indicator of divine involvement with humanity is the choice of ἔκστασις in Gen 2.21 and 15.12 as the translation of תרדמה, the 'deep sleep' in which Adam and Abram both encountered God. Whatever its exact meaning, this word also is evocative of divine activity and judgement. The effect is intensified by σφόδρα.

The emphasis discernible in Θ on Daniel as an eschatological visionary, subject to as well as an intermediary of the judgement of God, is further reinforced by another small variation between versions in v 28. While MT tells the reader that the source of Daniel's fear is '(his) thoughts' (רעיוני), the Septuagint pictures him as overcome by the external source of his vision, 'great distraction' (σφόδρα ἐκστάσει). This perspective on Daniel in the Septuagint has also been hinted at in chs 2 and 4.

#### **vision and interpretation: insignificant differences**

In the light of the point made immediately above, the possibility that the versions may understand the vision differently bears

---

<sup>53</sup>See Tov, 'Three Dimensions', 540f, on etymologizing renderings in the Septuagint.

examination. This will largely be done by looking at how the four beasts, the son of man, and the holy ones of the Most High are presented and then interpreted by each version. Before doing so, however, there are some apparent differences that need to be ruled out as insignificant. According to MT v 2, the four winds were 'churning up' (מגיתן) the sea. The Septuagint's view that the wind 'fell into' (ἐνέπεσον) the sea, like θ's προσέβαλλον, is more of an explanation of how the churning occurred. It may not be exactly literal, and may reflect an unfamiliarity with the mythological underpinnings of the vision, but it does not lose the essential elements. The four winds are still present. The sea as a source of chaos is not so evident, but the fact that the beasts emerge from the sea in both versions means that that aspect is also present in θ.<sup>54</sup> So the difference does not reflect any interpretation of the vision.

The large θ plus in v 8, 'and it made war against the holy ones' (καὶ ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους), is probably introduced from v 21. A likely Aramaic retroversion of the Greek ἐποίει πόλεμον (θ v 8) would be עבדה קרב ('did battle'), which occurs subsequently in MT at v 21. That suggests the plus represented in θ is more likely to have occurred in the *Vorlage*. That is the expression used by Theodotion to translate the Aramaic in v 21, where the Septuagint expresses the concept somewhat differently. The result of the plus is that θ anticipates a detail in Daniel's later recounting of his vision, so any literary effect that may have been intended by withholding that information in v 8 MT is not present. However it does not alter the position of the saints and the small horn with respect to each other. There is a similar plus in v 9, this time in MT, where the throne has 'its wheels blazing with fire' (גלגלתי נור דלק). The most likely explanation of the difference is a different *Vorlage*, and again there is no significance for the understanding of the vision. In either case, the Ezekiel source of the imagery is evident.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> See Anderson, 78, Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 97f, and from a slightly different perspective, Young, *Daniel*, 142.

<sup>55</sup> Grelot, 'Daniel VII,9-10', 82. Schaberg, 77, demonstrates the strength of the link between Daniel 7 and Ezekiel 1 in the frequency with which the two texts appear in combination in the midrashic history of each.

A similar case is the difference between versions in v 23. According to MT the fourth kingdom 'will be different from all the kingdoms and will devour all the earth', whereas the fourth kingdom of ̣ 'will be different from all the earth'. This is most likely to be a case of omission by homoeoteleuton between the two instances of כָּל־. As a result מְלֻכּוֹתָא וְתֹאכֵל is missing from the Septuagint's *Vorlage*. Even if that is not the correct explanation of the difference, the sense is not significantly altered.

The versions also differ in places over whether or not the beasts represent kings or kingdoms. The Masoretic Text speaks of 'four kings' (v 17, אַרְבַּעַה מְלָכִין) where ̣ has 'four kingdoms' (τέσσαρες βασιλείαι). At v 23 the versions are in agreement on 'kingdoms'. Given the prevailing argument that the distinction in Aramaic and Hebrew between 'king' and 'kingdom' is a fluid one, the difference does not disturb the picture of four regimes, probably personalized as particular monarchs.<sup>56</sup> In this light, the displacing of 'of / from the kingdom' in v 24 is interesting but does not alter the picture. Whether the phrase is used as indirect object of קִבְּצִין (MT) or as a modifier in the appositional clause καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα τῆς βασιλείας (̣), the sense is of ten kings from one kingdom. Again, no variation in interpretation of the vision results.

#### verses 26f: further insignificant differences

Verses 26f are difficult in both versions. The difficult Septuagint is probably a result of the translator trying to make sense of a problematic Aramaic *Vorlage*.<sup>57</sup> The sense of the Aramaic seems to run as follows: The court will sit in the future (יָתֵב) and still in the future will take away the sovereignty (שְׁלִטְנָה) of the last king. The possessive suffix refers back to the figure in v 25. The verb יִהְיוּ is a plural

<sup>56</sup>Lacocque, *Daniel*, 114, notes that the author uses king and kingdom indifferently. See also Goldingay, *Daniel*, 146. But contrast Montgomery, *Daniel*, 307, who regards βασιλείαι in ̣ v 17 as an interpretation.

<sup>57</sup>Sailhamer, 194, notes a tendency on the part of the ̣ translator, when confronted with difficult syntax, to rely on the most common equivalency even though the sense of the translation might suffer as a result.

although the singular court is doing the confiscating. It is therefore an impersonal usage, with the sense that something 'will be taken away', although the sitting court is still envisaged as the agent.

Then come two problematic haphel infinitives, **להשמידה** and **להובירה**, and the awkwardly placed 'until the end' (**עד-סופא**). The two difficulties are related to one another. We return to the infinitives after considering the positioning of **עד-סופא**. It is not evident how that phrase could apply to the infinitives immediately preceding it, yet it seems a long way from the finite verb. Perhaps the writer has drawn on a formula also evident in 6.27 where God's 'rule is until the end' (6.27, **שלטנה עד-סופא**). If that sort of association lies behind v 26, the point being made is that, unlike God, the eleventh king will not rule to the end. The placement of **עד-סופא** at the end of the sentence not only emphasizes the finite nature of this king's reign, but also enhances the contrast with the eternal kingdom of v 27. Another effect of the formula being split is to form a bracket around the phrase **והעדרן להשמידה ולהובירה**, which suggests that the sense of the infinitives should be thought of as part of a unit with the immediately preceding finite verb. One way to make this link is to take the prefixed **ל**'s as indicative of purpose, giving the idea that authority 'was taken away so that...'.<sup>58</sup> In that case the infinitives also need to be thought of in a passive sense even though they are active in form. From time to time the Aramaic of Daniel does require such an interpretation of the active infinitive.<sup>59</sup> Understanding **והעדרן** as an impersonal construction, we may translate the entire phrase, 'its rule until the end will be taken away so that it might be annihilated and destroyed'. In support of this interpretation, which makes the boastful horn recipient rather than provider of annihilation and destruction, it should be noted that the verb **אכר** also applies to the fate of the fourth beast in v 11.

<sup>58</sup>Bauer and Leander, 302, cite **להחטלה** in 2.13 as a similar example.

<sup>59</sup>Apart from this instance Stinespring, 392f, identifies infinitives active in form but passive in sense in 2.12 and 46; 3.2, 13 and 19; 4.3; 5.2 and 7; 6.9, 16, and 24. He argues that they are an extension of the third person plural indefinite idiom, and so are implicitly third person plural.

Then the singular **יְהִיבָהּ** (v 27, 'has been given') apparently treats the list of attributes, 'kingdom and rule and greatness' (**מַלְכוּתָהּ וְשִׁלְטָנָהּ וְגִבּוֹרָתָהּ**), as a collective noun. The exact referent of the third person singular **לָהּ** (v 27) remains ambiguous. It could either be the people (**עַם**) or the one who originally granted the authority. I return to this point when discussing the holy ones of the Most High.

There are several difficulties evident in the Septuagint of vv 26f. The confusion of persons is one instance. The court sits (**καθίσταται**, singular) and does away with (**ἀπολοῦσι**, plural) the king's authority. Next 'he gives' (v 27, singular, **ἔδωκε**) 'their' (v 27, plural, **αὐτῶν**) sovereignty to the holy ones of the Most High. It is clear neither who is giving authority nor whose authority is being given. The second instance is the **Θ** plus, 'they will plot' (v 26, **βουλεύσονται**). Not only is the plural unexpected, but it is also unclear who the subject of the verb is, the court or a figure reintroduced from v 25. In either case, the plural number is inappropriate. Whatever option is chosen, the sense is puzzling. The infinitives that **βουλεύσονται** governs, **μιᾶναι καὶ ἀπολέσαι**, are also difficult in that their use to describe the activity of God is unusual.

The variation in person is largely explicable as an attempt to deal with the Aramaic third person plural impersonal constructions in v 26. Often **Θ** renders this construction by a grammatical equivalence with no ill effect on the sense. In this case a literal rendering of **יְהִיבָהּ** with **ἀπολοῦσι** leaves the verb in search of an object. The Septuagintal solution is to read **שִׁלְטָנָהּ** as the accusative **ἐξουσίαν**. As a result the translator clearly views the court as the subject of both the subsequent verbs, 'will sit' and 'will take away', but allows the inconsistency of person between them to remain.

The same difficulty with person is evident in v 27. Word order suggests that the Septuagint is attempting to translate MT or something very like it. As noted earlier, the Aramaic has a singular peil, **יְהִיבָהּ**. The Greek equivalent is **ἔδωκε**, which is similarly placed in the sentence. It is intended to refer to the action of the court despite the use of an aorist active as equivalent to the Aramaic peil form. The use of a third person singular is explicable in terms of the Aramaic equivalent, despite



the normal  $\Theta$  habit of employing an aorist passive to represent the peil. Either the translator wishes to clarify that the court is the active subject of the verb, or he has tried to represent the MT syntax exactly and in so doing erroneously employed an active aorist. In either case the sense is not affected, even if the nuance of the passive is not available. The court is still the donor and the saints are still the recipients of authority.

The additional verb  $\betaουλεύσονται$  is also problematical. It may be representative of a *Vorlage* variant from the one preserved in MT. It is equally possible that it provides an explanatory note from the translator, possibly in an attempt to represent the force of the  $\text{ל}$  prefixes on  $\text{שָׁמַד}$  and  $\text{אָבַד}$  suggested above. Whatever the source of the verb, its form as a third person plural future indicative is in parallel with  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$  and derives also from the third person plural impersonal idiom of the Aramaic. Even if the translator fails to understand the Aramaic as equivalent to a Greek passive, as appears to be the case with  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ , the same subject is implied by  $\Theta$  as by MT. The sitting court is understood as the author of the action represented by both finite verbs. In the same vein the infinitives  $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\alpha\iota$  καὶ  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$  are literal translations of the active infinitives in MT, even though they probably carry a passive sense in the Aramaic. The resultant Greek syntax leaves a question mark over who exactly does the polluting and destroying, but the likelihood is that the  $\Theta$  translator understands the same subject as MT, however badly he may have conveyed that in his translation.

One problem with the foregoing argument is that  $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\alpha\iota$  is a surprising rendering of  $\text{שָׁמַד}$  to describe divine activity. It does not occur again in Daniel but is common elsewhere in the Septuagint. It almost invariably translates the Hebrew  $\text{שָׁמַד}$  with its strong connotations of ritual defilement or pollution. In later Aramaic the semantic range of  $\text{שָׁמַד}$  also came to include the concept of being forced into apostasy. If the Septuagint choice of vocabulary has been influenced by that, it could suggest that the infinitives are meant by  $\Theta$  to express the activity of the eleventh horn rather than that of the heavenly court. If that is the case it could be a reflection of the cultic concerns of the Old Greek

translation.<sup>60</sup> However, that point on its own does not explain the presence of βουλεύσονται adequately, and is not sufficient to overturn the previous argument. As with the difficulty over person in vv 26f, questions raised by the phrase beginning βουλεύσονται can substantially be understood to reflect the difficult syntax of the *Vorlage*.

The pronoun αὐτῶν, which is a plus in ℣ v 27, is a further difficulty in translation. At one level it is no more than an attempt to clarify whose authority is being given to the holy ones. In that sense it is the same sort of plus as 'made war against the holy ones' (ἐποίει πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους) noted in v 8. The translator may also have been confused by the MT treatment of the expression ...מלכותה ושלטנא ודבוחא (v 27, 'kingdom and rule and greatness...') as a collective singular. But it is also a further manifestation of the tension evident in vv 26f between representing the syntax accurately and preserving the sense of the Aramaic idiom. Its occurrence in conjunction with the singular subject of ἔδωκε means that the plural of the pronoun is in grammatical agreement with ἀπολοῦσι καὶ βουλεύσονται in v 26, even though it is intended to convey the sense of the Aramaic that the authority belongs to the one who gives (singular). Once again, a difficult *Vorlage*, rather than theological interpretation on the part of the Septuagint, has given rise to the divergence.

#### **differences in understanding of the four beasts**

Because the variations above probably stem from difficulties in translation or in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, they do not necessarily point to differences in understanding between ℣ and MT. But there are some more significant divergences. A look at the depictions of the four beasts, individually and in their relationships to one another, provides examples. The theme of speech creeps into the ℣ portrayal of both the second and third creatures. This is implicit in the case of the bear-like creature. Instead of hearing a command the beast itself

---

<sup>60</sup>Note the parallel in Is 43.28 where ℣ reads a cultic pollution in the Hebrew שִׁמְיָה. The Septuagint translates with μιᾶναι but reapplies the first person so that it is not God but the leaders who profane the sanctuary. See the discussion of Elliger, 362, on this point.

speaks: 'and he / it spoke thus...' (v 5, καὶ οὕτως εἶπεν). This in itself may be no more than another Septuagintal attempt at the impersonal passive, but it forms an interesting link with the more explicit Greek description of the leopard. The Masoretic Text gives the third beast 'rule' (v 6, שִׁלְטָן), whereas it receives from the Septuagint 'speech' (γλῶσσα).<sup>61</sup> The resulting humanization of the earlier beasts is also evident in v 7. The Masoretic Text seems to view the fourth beast as qualitatively different from what has come before with the absolute statement, 'It was different from all the beasts who were before it' (מִשְׁנֵיה מִן כָּל-חַיָּוִת דִּי קִדְמֶיהָ).<sup>62</sup> The Septuagint, which has already humanized the second and third beasts, merely says that 'it behaved differently' (διαφόρως χρώμενον) from its predecessors. In the 5 view the fourth beast is an unpleasant continuation of what has gone before rather than an entirely different type.

A lessening of the distinction between beasts on the part of the Septuagint is observable elsewhere in ch 7. The picture presented by MT in vv 11f is that judgement is passed on the boastful horn, who is then destroyed and given over to the burning. At that point, the earlier beasts are also deprived of their influence, but their fate contrasts with that of the horn when they are given a 'prolongation of life' (v 12, אֲרִכָּה בַחַיִּין). In the Septuagint also the boastful horn is destroyed and burned, but in v 12 his authority over those round about him is also removed. There is no mention of 'the rest of the beasts' (MT v 12, שְׂאֵר חַיָּוִת). As told by 5, they fade from the vision entirely. The other figures in 5 v 12 are not the other beasts but 'those round about him' (τοὺς κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ). As a result, there is no contrast between the last king and the former powers. A further difference is that the syntax of the Septuagint draws a direct link between the little horn and the figures in v 12, whereas there is no such link in MT.

The differences are partly explicable in terms of translation

---

<sup>61</sup>Jeansonne, 119, cites Montgomery, *Daniel*, 295, in support of her point that γλῶσσα represents a misreading of שִׁלְטָן as שֶׁן through metathesis of ש and ל. Neither Jeansonne nor Montgomery give other examples of the same type of misreading.

<sup>62</sup>Caquot, 'Sur les Quatre Bêtes', 13

issues. In particular, the change of person probably comes about in a rendering of the impersonal haphel הִעָרִי. They can perhaps also partly be understood in historical terms. It remains an open question whether or not the vision of Daniel is intended to portray the earlier empires as still in existence at the time of the critical later events.<sup>63</sup> Verse 12 suggests that is so, but there is nothing in the interpretation of the vision to back up the notion. The Septuagint puts no such interpretation on the events foreshadowed by the vision. The earlier beasts are not required to be present in vv 11f. The best that can be said is that they may be included in 'those round about (the little horn)', to whom a 'time of life' (χρόνος ζωῆς) was given. However that is far from clear in the Septuagint version of the vision, and even if it is the case, they exist as well as, rather than in contrast to, the boastful little horn.

This difference is further illustrated in vv 19 and 24. The former verse displays again the same lack of distinction observable in vv 11f. The Masoretic Text describes the fourth beast as 'different from all of them' (v 19, שָׂדֵה מִן-כֻּלָּהֶן), whereas the Septuagint omits that phrase and moves directly into a description of the beast.<sup>64</sup> In v 24 also the last king is not different in kind from his predecessors according to 5. He merely differs from 'the first (kings)' (v 24, τοὺς πρώτους) in his 'evil deeds' (κακοῖς). The Masoretic Text emphasizes rather that the king is different from 'the former ones' (קִדְמָיָא) themselves, not from their deeds.<sup>65</sup>

Both versions agree at v 3 where it is said that the beasts are

---

<sup>63</sup>Caquot, 'Les Quatre Bêtes', 40f, explores the ambivalence of MT on that point. See the full discussion by Rowley, *Darius the Mede*, 144ff, on the possible identities of the four kingdoms.

<sup>64</sup>In v 19 Ziegler emends διαφθείροντος ('destroying') to διαφέρωντος ('differing'), and Jeansonne, 94, argues on the grounds of orthographic corruption that Ziegler is a more likely reflection of the Old Greek. But P967 and 88-Syh agree on διαφθείροντος.

<sup>65</sup>The Masoretic Text tradition of the different fourth beast is also present in the Epistle of Barnabas 4.5, where it is said to be 'wicked and powerful and fiercer than all the beasts of the sea' (translation by Reeves, 2). Reeves, 4, sees in the Epistle of Barnabas several points of correspondence with the Oracle of Hystaspes.

'different one from the other' (διαφέροντα ἓν παρὰ τὸ ἓν, שְׁנֵי דָא מִן דָא). However, from that point they differ somewhat in the manner outlined above on the nature of that difference. The Masoretic Text tends to place the fourth beast and then the eleventh king in a different category. The Septuagint rather sees them as the culmination of a process.

### differences in understanding of the son of man

If these differences in the way the beasts are distinguished from one another are finely drawn and partly due to translation technique, variations in the way the figure like a son of man is treated are more clearly distinguishable. The first task in dealing with these variations is to establish the most likely text of the Septuagint at the crucial v 13.

The phrase ὥς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ('one like an ancient of days') poses a problem. Montgomery has labelled this as an erroneous reading which attempts to render MT כְּעֶבֶד.<sup>66</sup> However, Lust points out that ὥς is the reading of P967, so there is no textual evidence available in support of its emendation to ἕως.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the nominative form of παλαιὸς that follows is correct for the reading as it stands. If ἕως were correct, we would expect it to take a genitive, as happens in θ. Despite the inconvenience caused by the fact, the reading 'one like an ancient of days' must be allowed to stand in Θ. Another textual problem concerns the final phrase of the Greek. The reading preferred by Rahlfs, following 88-Syh, is παρῆσαν αὐτῷ ('were by / with him'). P967, in contrast, witnesses to προσήγαγον αὐτῷ, but Lust this time considers the Cologne papyrus to be in error. His grounds are that it is grammatically incorrect, and has come about as a corruption from Theodotion / Masoretic Text.<sup>68</sup> In fact, there does not need to be a grammatical problem with the P967 reading. The προσήγαγον form is the second aorist third person

---

<sup>66</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 304

<sup>67</sup>Lust, 'Daniel 7.13', 65

<sup>68</sup>Lust, 'Daniel 7.13', 64

plural of προσάγω, used intransitively with αὐτῷ as its indirect object. Hence, 'they (the bystanders) drew close to him'. Other occurrences of this form in the Septuagint may be found in Num 7.3 and 15.33 as well as Sus 52. If there has been no cause to doubt the reliability of P967 for the rest of v 13, there seems no grounds for rejecting it at this point. Indeed, the whole verse makes adequate grammatical sense as presented by P967.<sup>69</sup> The sense is as follows: 'on the clouds of heaven one like a son of man came and one like an ancient of days was nearby, and those standing by drew near to him'. That is the meaning presumed for the rest of this discussion.

The most obvious difference between the versions at v 13 is the question of whether the son of man arrives 'with the clouds of heaven' (MT, עַם-עֲנֹנֵי שָׁמַיָא) or 'on the clouds of heaven' (G, ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). Are the prepositions עַם and ἐπὶ equivalent or not? The Greek rendering could represent על in its *Vorlage*, or it could be an interpretation of the preposition עַם on the part of the translator. Some say that there is no significance in the difference.<sup>70</sup> Prepositions are extremely fluid, and it is possible that ἐπὶ possessed a shade of meaning appropriate to עַם in the mind of the translator. The argument then continues that even if there is a distinction, whether in translation or in the *Vorlage*, there is no difference in the way the son of man is viewed by each version. The divinity or otherwise of the son of man cannot be decided on the choice of preposition.

The data available for a discussion on the usage of Semitic and Greek prepositions, and their equivalence between languages, are obviously extensive. By the very nature of their varied usage, firm conclusions are almost impossible to arrive at, as exceptions can generally be found to support a point of view. But the evidence of the prepositions in this particular instance should not be dismissed out of hand. A study of their use by individual authors and translators can be

---

<sup>69</sup>Jeansonne, 11 and 98, sees προσηγᾶγον as an example of an original reading in P967, but agrees with Ziegler's emendation of ὡς to ἕως plus the genitive.

<sup>70</sup>For example, Goldingay, *Daniel*, 145, and Jeansonne, 113.



indicative of style and usage. With the prepositions currently in question there is a remarkable consistency in the way the Greek represents the Aramaic throughout Daniel 2-7. The preposition **עם** is found 15 times. It most often has the sense of 'with / along with / among' (2.11 and 18; 4.12, 20, 22 and 29; 5.21; 7.13). Once it is used to describe someone talking 'with / to' another (6.22), and once it occurs in a sentence that speaks of making war 'with / against' someone (7.21). In 2.43 and 3.33 occur idiomatic uses of **עם** which do not have formal equivalents in Greek. The Septuagint translations of these occurrences do not reveal a distinct pattern. There is no **ὅ** equivalent to the occurrences of **עם** in chs 4 (including 3.33) and 5. Excluding the exceptional Semitic usage in 2.43 (**דנה עם־דנה**), **עם** is translated variously with **ἄμα** (2.18), **μετὰ** (2.11 and 4.15), the dative (2.43 and 6.22), and **προς** (7.21). This analysis excludes **καθ'** in 7.2, because the sense of **עם** there presents its own problems.<sup>71</sup> The variety in this part of the evidence renders it unremarkable that **ἐπὶ** is found in v 13.

However, it should be noted that each of the different ways of rendering **עם** in the Septuagint, except at v 13, is an attempt at a particular portion of its semantic range. Such is clearly not the case at v 13. It is also instructive to see how the Septuagint uses **ἐπὶ** elsewhere in Daniel 2-7. It is found 56 times, of which 26 probably have an equivalent in the Masoretic Text. Of those, **ἐπὶ** represents **על** eighteen times, functions as an object indicator equivalent to **קדם** three times, and is the equivalent of prefixed **ב** or **ל** four times. It only corresponds to **עם** in v 13. If there are not enough examples with which to rule on **ὅ**'s rendering of **על**, there are enough instances of its use of **ἐπὶ** to say that, except in v 13, the Septuagint of Daniel is consistent in its employment of that preposition. Note too that not once does Theodotion use **ἐπὶ** as a translation of **עם**.

On the evidence of the above examples it is most likely that the

---

<sup>71</sup>The **עם** of v 2 is unusual. Bentzen, *Daniel*, 30, likens its usage there to 3.33 and 4.31, but Charles, *Daniel*, 175, supposes the **ו** represented by **ὅ** and **θ** to be original. The suggestion of Delcor, 'Sources', 303, that **עם** in both vv 2 and 13 expresses temporal co-existence is intriguing but unlikely. It would be more convincing if the recurring expression of which **עם** is a part in v 2 showed this variation elsewhere.

Septuagintal use of ἐπὶ represents a relationship something like the one described by Aramaic ܥܠ. As it is used in Dan 2-7, ܥܠ usually means 'on / upon' and describes a spatial relationship of some sort. We have already seen the many instances which are represented in ̔ by ἐπὶ. This is still the major use when a number of other occurrences which have no equivalent in the Septuagint are taken into account. It can also mean 'to' (for example 2.24, 6.7 and 7.16) or 'against' (3.19 and 29). The sense is still physical, and where there is a Septuagintal equivalent, it is πρὸς (2.24 and 7.16), ἐναντίον (6.7), or εἰς (3.29/96). On the rare occasions when ܥܠ has the more abstract sense of 'concerning' (2.18; 7.16 and 19), ̔ uses either περὶ (2.18 and 7.19) or ὑπὲρ (7.16). The preposition also appears in 3.19 and 6.14 as part of untranslatable Aramaic idioms, and so cannot be used in the present discussion. The point of all this is to suggest that the Septuagint does distinguish between ܥܡ and ܥܠ. From whatever angle the rendering of prepositions from Aramaic into Greek is examined, the distinction is observed except at 7.13. It must then be concluded that the difference in meaning was one that would have been understood and observed by the translator. The evidence of the prepositions also provides a strong case for the view that the difference was there in the *Vorlage* rather than produced in translation.

The uses of both ܥܡ and ἐπὶ are not so broad as to provide an overlap of semantic range. But that still does not tell us whether or not the different prepositions betray a theological difference.<sup>72</sup> In short, is the son of man 'on' (̔) the clouds different from the son of man 'with' (MT) the clouds? An answer to those questions requires us to shift our sights beyond the prepositions to the 'clouds' (MT, ܥܡܝ; ̔, νεφέλων) imagery of which they are a part. Even then, as many have observed, in general terms clouds are often indicative of a theophany, and such would be the case whatever preposition is preferred at v 13.<sup>73</sup> Ps 18.11f and Ex 13.21 and 19.16 are cases in point, and 2 Mac 2.8

---

<sup>72</sup>Lust, 'Daniel 7.13', 64, sees ἐπὶ as a deliberate consequence of ̔'s identification of the son of man with the Ancient of Days. But contrast Casey, *Son of Man*, 29.

<sup>73</sup>For example Young, *Daniel's Vision*, 13, and Coppens and Dequeker, 60.

provides a later example. So we need to consider how the use of different prepositions affects the functioning of the imagery.

The evidence is mixed for the MT reference **עם-עני**. There are no exact equivalents of the phrase to be found in Biblical Hebrew. However, **עם** is more likely than **על** to describe general connections between ideas or images. The statement that the son of man comes 'with' the clouds remains undefined. It is not clear whether he is in the clouds or alongside them, or simply evocative of them by the nature of his presence. He may be with or in the clouds yet remain apart from the divinity represented by them. There are many biblical examples that express the same sort of ambivalent understanding of cloud imagery. Sometimes objects or people are covered or suffused with the divine nimbus. The cloud appeared on the mercy seat (Lev 16.2) and on Mount Sinai (Ex 24.15ff). In the latter example Moses himself went up into the divine presence by entering the cloud. However it is important to note that this experience of God in the cloud did not in any way make Moses divine.<sup>74</sup> At other times the cloud remains an object apart, as a signal that God is present in the cloud. Such is the case with the pillar of cloud in the wilderness (Ex 13.21f). On occasions the cloud forms a mantle for God, indicative of his majesty or otherness (Lam 3.44). Sometimes the clouds are regarded in a more universal sense as signs of God's creative activity (Job 26.8f). In each case, although the forms of expression vary, God is in or with, rather than upon, the cloud. Those who encounter him do so by encountering the cloud, but without being granted any of its divinity.

A further apposite reference is from Ez 38.9 and 16, where the imagery is given a new twist. There the divine judgement against Israel is expressed in the military activity of 'Gog of the land of Magog' (Ez

---

<sup>74</sup>Though some Jewish interpreters came close to seeing Moses as divine. See for example Ezekiel the Tragedian in the second century BCE, who was obviously in debt to Greek thought forms. In his work Moses mounts a heavenly throne and receives a sceptre (II 74f), and the stars worship him (II 79f). But even here the distinction between divine and human is preserved, since the literary setting of these details is a dream which Moses' father-in-law must interpret for Moses (II 83-89). Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha II*, 803f and 812.

38.2, גוג ארץ המגוג). His armies will cover the land 'like a cloud' (Ez 38.9, כענן). The land is covered with divine judgement as if by a cloud, but the human agent of that judgement by no means comes to share in the divinity of the one who sent him. The best that can be said of one who comes 'with' the clouds is that he has a special place in the activity of God. Whether he is a divine figure or not remains ambiguous.<sup>75</sup>

When it comes to the use of 'upon (על) the clouds' there is again no directly equivalent example available. Yet a clearer picture emerges from an examination of the biblical tradition. Is 19.1 depicts the Lord riding 'on a swift cloud' (על-עב קל). Ps 104.3 provides a similar picture, this time of God 'who makes the clouds his chariot' (השם-עבים רכובו).<sup>76</sup> This phrase is in parallel with 'who rides on the wings of the wind' (המהלך על-כנפי-רוח). There is a similar pairing of images in Ps 18.10f. Each item in the pair also figures as a representation of the divine presence in Ezekiel 1, a probable source of some of the imagery in Daniel 7. The linking of cloud and chariot through the preposition על in the Septuagint *Vorlage* is therefore strongly resonant of divinity. Is 14 is also instructive. The 'day star' (Is 14.12, הילל) is condemned because he aspires to be 'above the heights of the clouds' (Is 14.14, על-במתי עב) so that he might be like the Most High. Being above or on the clouds in this context appears to mean equality with God. The use of על and its ὅ translation as ἐπὶ in Is 19 and Ps 104 is a further indicator that the figure in v 13 who arrives 'on' (ἐπὶ) the clouds is likely to be divine.<sup>77</sup> The same cannot necessarily be said of the one who arrives 'with' (עם) the clouds.

A comparison of the relationship of the son of man to the assembled company (MT v 16, קאמיו; ὁ v 13, οἱ παρευστηκότες) once he arrives supports that suggestion. The Masoretic Text paints a picture of the son of man being presented to a superior figure by a group already in attendance: he 'was brought before him (the Ancient of Days)' (v 13,

---

<sup>75</sup>Delcor, *Daniel*, 154

<sup>76</sup>Young, *Daniel's Vision*, 12

<sup>77</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 303

קדמוי הקרבוהי). After his arrival in the Septuagint, it is ambiguously stated that 'those standing by drew close to him' (οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτῷ). The haphel קרבוהי is apparently taken by 6 in an active sense and either the suffix on קרב or the entire word קדמוי is ignored. The most likely of the two possibilities is that קדמוי is treated as an untranslatable unit, and προσήγαγον αὐτῷ translates the haphel verb literally, without taking into account its use as an impersonal plural. As a result the son of man is not brought forward by attendants, but stands with the Ancient of Days. It is not clear from αὐτῷ to which of the two figures the bystanders draw near in the Septuagint. However, in v 14, which must be understood with v 13, the referent of the third person masculine singular pronoun must be the son of man. It is clearly the recently arrived figure who is the recipient of authority and homage. Therefore the pronoun at the end of v 13 probably also refers to the son of man as the one towards whom the bystanders draw near in homage. The word chosen by 6 to express this, προσάγω, is pregnant in the present instance. It is a word with a broad semantic range, but is often used in the context of bringing offerings or prayers to God. Such is the case in the already noted Num 7.3, and Tob 12.12 uses the word to speak of bringing prayers to God. That meaning is not inevitable but in this context it resonates of worship directed towards the son of man.

The versions are much closer to each other in v 14. They both agree that the sovereignty granted the son of man is derived (6, ἐδόθη; MT, יָדַיִן). They also agree that the service offered him is the same sort of service that is due divinity. As I noted earlier, this is portrayed in MT by the word פָּלַח. Whenever the Septuagint translates that word in Daniel, it does so with the verb λατρεύω. We have seen in earlier chapters that that too is a word preserved for dealings with the divine. But the Greek is also not quite equivalent to the Aramaic in that it tends to suggest a cultic understanding more than is the case with פָּלַח. This point is explicated in the discussion on Daniel 6.<sup>78</sup> Incidentally, in v 14 Theodotion chooses to translate פָּלַח with δουλεύω, a term which we

---

<sup>78</sup>Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 321ff, notes this practice of imposing the dominant meaning of a word on other meanings, and the distortions that can result.

have noted is more generally applicable than λατρεύω to human relationships of subservience.

A second small shift in emphasis between the versions may also be observed in v 14. In MT, the enduring nature of the rule given the son of man is expounded in parallel statements each with a simple negative. It 'will not pass away' (v 14, לֹא יֵעָרֶה) and it 'will not be destroyed' (לֹא תִתְחַבֵּל). The syntax of ט in the last part of that verse is a little uncertain, but the same parallel statements seem to be intended. However, the translator has chosen the emphatic negative construction of οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive in each phrase. In so doing, the Septuagint captures the sense inherent in the Semitic parallel structure, but strengthens it with the emphatic negative.

When the above evidence concerning v 13 is weighed, the son of man in the Septuagint seems to bear the mark of a divine figure in a way that the MT son of man does not. The ambiguity of the phrase 'like a son of man' (MT, כְּבֶן-אָדָם; ט, ὡς υἱός ἀνθρώπου) is present in both versions, but the Septuagint's use of ἐπὶ and portrayal of the heavenly audience clarifies that ambiguity. When it comes to v 14 the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint agree that the figure who arrives on the clouds is vested with a special authority, an authority that is eternal in scope. Indeed the homage offered him is of the sort appropriate to God. This on its own need not make him a divine figure any more than Nebuchadnezzar's response to Daniel in 2.46 makes Daniel divine, although in that case the key words, פָּלַח and λατρεύω, are not present. It remains an open question in MT whether or not the son of man's authority becomes intrinsic or remains derived. The Septuagint has decided in favour of the first option. As a result, the divinity of the son of man perceived by ט in v 14 is read back into v 13 and so affects the translation.<sup>83</sup> The translator chooses options that are possible renderings of the Aramaic, but cumulatively they tend to take the meaning in a particular direction. The Septuagint might well also have been working with a *Vorlage* that

---

<sup>83</sup> According to Caquot, 'Les Quatre Bêtes', 70, the ט translation of 7.13 begins the process of transforming the son of man into 'un objet de foi'. Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 26, attributes this to Christian influence, but his view has found little support.



tended in the same direction by witnessing to **על** instead of **עם** in v 13.

### differences in understanding of the holy ones

One way of treating the son of man is as an element in the vision which is later interpreted, just as the beasts are later interpreted.<sup>84</sup> The cue for this approach is taken from the suggestion inherent in the **כ** prefix that the son of man should be thought of in the same light as the beasts. They are only 'like' (vv 4 and 6, **כ**; v 5, **דמויה**) certain animals, and the interpretation is necessary to reveal what or who they represent. In the same way the figure on the clouds is only 'like' a son of man and his referent must be discovered through interpretation. If such an approach is followed through, the son of man turns out to be representative of 'the holy ones of the Most High' (v 18, **קדושי עליון**, ἅγιοι ὑψίστου) in the interpretation. In that case, a comparison of the way each version understands the holy ones should show up differences consistent with those noted in their respective treatments of the son of man.

First mention of the holy ones comes at v 18 in the celestial interpreter's brief summary of the meaning of Daniel's vision. The four beasts are the four kings (v 17), and then the holy ones receive the kingdom. In the Masoretic Text an expansion on the vision begins at this first mention. In the vision the rule of the son of man is 'eternal' (v 14, **עלם**) which means that it 'will not pass away' (**לא יעדה**) and it 'will not be destroyed' (**לא תהחבל**). The Septuagint expounds this quality with the emphatic negative. In the interpretation the sovereignty of the holy ones will be 'forever and ever and ever' (v 18, **עד-עלמא ועד עלם עלמא**). This emphatic form is reproduced exactly in the Old Greek. As with the **ט** plus of v 8, the greater emphasis of the Septuagint in v 14 is perhaps an anticipation of the interpretation.

The next appearance comes when Daniel shares with the interpreter some more detail of his vision of the fourth beast and its horns (vv

---

<sup>84</sup>This is the view of Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, 75, as part of his theory that Dan 7 may be understood as the 'eschatologizing of Psalm 2'.

21f). The particulars are essentially the same in both versions, with the small difference that the verb used in  $\Theta$  to denote the defeat of the holy ones (τροπέω) has connotations of flight not present in יכל. In each case the holy ones end up in possession of a kingdom, although its eternal nature is not specified by Daniel. In v 25 of the interpretation also, the versions agree that the arrogant king will wear down or 'exhaust' ( $\Theta$ , κατατρίψει; MT, יבלא) the holy ones.

Once we get to v 27, however, there are notable differences in the way the versions convey their understanding of the holy ones. The most obvious is the difference in syntax, yet the variation in syntax on its own is not indicative of a variation in meaning. Both MT and  $\Theta$  contain the same number of terms conveying concepts of governance and in the same order, even though they are in slightly different relationship to one another. Moreover they correspond to the way the Septuagint has translated those terms, both in ch 7 and in the earlier narratives. The one possible exception is  $\Theta$ 's use of a term more usually favoured by  $\theta$ , τὴν ἀρχὴν, as equivalent to מלכות.

Apart from questions of syntax, there are two particularly knotty problems presented in this verse. First there is the unique appearance of the phrase 'people of the holy ones of the Most High' (v 27, עם קדישי עליון), witnessed to in MT but not directly in the  $\Theta$  equivalent, λαὸν ἁγίων.<sup>85</sup> A number of commentators have struggled with this unique usage of עם in harness with the recurring construct phrase קדישי עליון.<sup>86</sup> In the absence of any other guidance from the immediate context and in the face of ambivalent evidence elsewhere, I accept the argument that 'holy ones of the Most High' is equivalent to 'people of

---

<sup>85</sup>The plural עליון is unexpected. The singular עליון as in CD 20.8 is the expected reading. See Lohse, 104. The plural is usually explained as a hebraizing plural of majesty. See Montgomery, *Daniel*, 307, Slotki, 61, and Young, *Daniel*, 158. Goldingay, 'Holy Ones', 496f, protests that Aramaic does not even do that for אלה. He sees it as a genuine plural, as part of his argument for a celestial understanding of the holy ones.

<sup>86</sup>Delcor, 'Sources', 303, sees in this usage a hesitancy about identifying the son of man with Yahweh.

the holy ones of the Most High'.<sup>87</sup> The second problem, one of particular interest to the present comparison, is that of person within verse 27.

In MT sovereignty is granted (יהיבת) the people of the holy ones. The verb is a peil form which does not require a subject to be specified, and we have seen that the singular probably treats the preceding list (מלכותה ושלטנא ורבותא) as a collective noun. Then after his reception of authority, all rules will serve and obey the ambiguous 'him' (לה). It is possible that the referent is עם, as this collective noun normally takes a singular verb.<sup>88</sup> Such is the case in 3.29 and Ezra 6.12. On the other hand it could be the court, which is the subject of v 26 and hence the implied subject of יהיבת. When the court first appears in Daniel's early account of his vision, the Ancient of Days seems to preside over events and there is no interest in the occupants of the other thrones. The actions of the court thereby become the actions of the Ancient of Days, who is indistinguishable from the Most High. This link is not made in the interpretations, but can be carried forward into them. Hence the eternal kingdom at the end of v 27 could also be that of the Most High. The syntax of this verse explicitly links ownership of the eternal kingdom (מלכות עלם) with receipt of worship due to divinity. In that connection the verb פלח has been explicated elsewhere. However, the same link is made in v 14 of the vision report although the syntax is different. As we have seen, in that context the recipient of worship and possessor of the kingdom is the son of man, not the court. That makes it more likely that the third person singular in v 27 refers to the people of the saints. The construction of v 27 and its predecessors allows rather than demands this but it is consistent with what has gone before. It is also possible that the ambiguity of the verse is a deliberate link back to the son of man in the vision. This verse then becomes the culmination of the process of divinization that we have discerned. Just as the son of man was given divine authority, so have the people of the

---

<sup>87</sup>Casey, *Son of Man*, 41

<sup>88</sup>The same phenomenon is observable in Ex 1 where עם בני ישראל (Ex 1.9, 'the people of the sons of Israel'), בני ישראל (Ex 1.1, 7 and 12, 'the sons of Israel'), and עם (Ex 1.20, 'the people') are treated synonymously. The fuller expression of Ex 1.9 takes a singular complement (רב ועצים) whereas 'sons of Israel' is grammatically plural.

holy ones of the Most High.<sup>89</sup> The two are now indistinguishable, a point that is later expressed by the celestial imagery of 12.3.

The Septuagint's grappling with an ambivalent Aramaic *Vorlage* results in several differences in the way v 27 is rendered. The active aorist ἔδωκε appears to be an attempt at rendering דָּבַר, but the active verb cannot help but raise the question of its subject in a way that the passive of MT does not. This is most likely to be the court or the Ancient of Days. All of this authority is given 'to the holy people of the Most High' (v 27, λαῶ ἁγίῳ ὑψίστου), a translation which preserves equivalence of elements but is clearly interpretative of עַם קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹן. Elsewhere the holy ones of the Most High are plural in their grammatical function (see vv 18 and 22), but the singular expression used here makes it possible that the holy people is the referent of αὐτῷ each time it appears. As that pronoun is an indirect object for each of the verbs ὑποταγήσονται and πειθαρχήσουσιν, it must be possible that 'all authorities' (πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι) are subject to the holy people. Thus far, the Septuagint follows MT in having the Ancient of Days or the celestial court grant authority to the holy ones.

However we must now take account of the verbs ὑποταγήσονται ('(they) will be subject to') and πειθαρχήσουσιν ('(they) will be obedient to') in the last part of 5 v 27. They are strange choices with which to translate פָּלַח וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶהוּ ('they will serve and obey'), as they appear to secularize the sense of פָּלַח and שָׁחָה. The expected word in the Greek for פָּלַח would have been either δουλεύω, chosen by Theodotion, or λατρεύω, the significance of which have been discussed in detail in an earlier chapter. But a survey of these other verbs as used in other parts of the Septuagint is instructive. Little can be said about πειθαρχέω, as its only other certain occurrence is in 1 Esdr 8.90. There it is used to speak of obedience to the law.

An examination of ὑποτάσσω, on the other hand, is more revealing. The word is used in an assortment of ways and translates at least five Hebrew words (כָּנַשׁ, 1 Chr 22.18; שָׁחָה, Ps 8.7; דָּבַר, Ps 17.48; דָּנָם, Ps 36.7;

---

<sup>89</sup> See the exposition of this view by Hartman and DiLella, 101f.

דָּרַךְ, Ps 143.2), none of which have the same connotations of worship as פָּלַח. In 2 Maccabees it is used in a different sense again as a term of military rank (2 Mac 4.12; 8.9 and 22). Yet in the midst of this variety there is one theme picked out by the  $\Theta$  translator's choice of ὑποτάσσω. That theme is epitomized in Psalm 8, in which v 7 tells us that God puts the works of his hands under the sovereignty (the verb is כִּשַׁל) of humanity, and 'places' (שָׂתַח) everything under his feet. The Septuagint translates the latter verb with ὑπετάξας. The concept of godly rule being given to a created people is also found in Ps 17.48, 46.4 and 143.2 each time with a different Hebrew verb, but each time rendered ὑποτάσσω in  $\Theta$ . Variations on this theme are also present in Wis 8.14 and 1 Chr 22.18. In the former, wisdom is extolled as the means by which 'nations will become subject to me (the speaker)' (Wis 8.14, ἔθνη ὑποταγήσεταιί μοι). In the Chronicles reference, David notes that God has subjected the land to the Lord and his people (ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον κυρίου καὶ ἐναντίον λαοῦ αὐτοῦ). In each case again, the verb ὑποτάσσω is used.

The choice of verbs in the last part of v 27  $\Theta$  suggests that the transfer of God's authority to his people has been understood by the Septuagint in terms of the tradition outlined above. The holy people therefore are simply human agents and the divinized son of man remains a separate entity.<sup>90</sup> This effect is reinforced by the  $\Theta$  plus of the possessive plural pronouns modifying the sovereignty words. As a result of their use, the holy ones acquire the sovereignty previously exercised by the little horn. It is as if the Septuagint, unlike the Masoretic Text, draws back from identifying the holy ones of the Most High completely with the son of man. Perhaps this relates also to the more emphatic divinization of the figure on the clouds in  $\Theta$ . The Septuagint is reluctant to picture the holy ones in the ranks of angels or divine figures. The son of man of the vision remains a distinct figure rather than a symbol for the holy ones of Israel. This more earthy depiction of the holy ones on the part of  $\Theta$  tallies with other translation decisions made, that together tend to take the meaning in a particular direction.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Compare Anderson, 87, who argues the same point for MT by referring to Is 61.5-9.

<sup>91</sup> Young, *Daniel*, 154, who is insistent that the son of man is a divine figure, considers the Septuagint to be a correct interpretation in this

There are a number of explicit clues that encourage the reader to contrast Daniel as visionary with Daniel as interpreter. Once the date has been set, we are told that Daniel 'saw a dream and visions of his head upon his bed' (v 1, חלם חזוה וחזווי ראשה על-משכבה). The reader is put in mind of Daniel's own words to King Nebuchadnezzar, 'this is your dream and visions of your head upon your bed' (2.28, חלמך וחזווי ראשך על-משכבך). Apart from the pronominal suffixes, the phrasing is almost identical. Almost the same phrase also appears in Nebuchadnezzar's account of another of his dreams (4.7 and 10). At other times the sage tells of his 'visions of the night' (vv 2, 7 and 13, חזווי (עם-)ליליא) or, as a variation, of 'visions of my head' (v 15, חזווי ראשי). The same variety of expression is seen in chs 2 and 4 of the king's dreams. Nebuchadnezzar also saw 'visions of the night' (2.19, חזווי די-ליליא) and 'visions of my head' (4.2, חזווי ראשי).<sup>92</sup> It begins to look as if the roles have now been reversed.

This becomes clear when the physical effect of the dreams on Daniel is noted. After the vision, he records that 'my spirit was troubled' (v 15, אחכרית רוחי) and the visions 'frightened me' (v 15, יבהלני). Things were not much better after he heard the interpretation, when 'my thoughts frightened me and my colours changed upon me' (v 28, רעיוני יבהלני ורוי ישתנן עלי). Nebuchadnezzar also found his 'spirit' (רוח) troubled as a result of dreams (2.1 and 3), and was frightened (בהל) by his experiences (4.2). V 28 is an almost word for word reflection of Belshazzar's response to his own encounter with God (5.6 and 10), except that the order is reversed and the Babylonian king also had trouble with the knots of his loins. The distinction between Daniel of ch 7 and of chs 2-6 is not an absolute one. The sage also found that 'his thoughts frightened him' (4.16, רעיוני יבהלנה) as the interpretation

---

direction.

<sup>92</sup>The use of די in 2.19 but not in ch 7 has no significance. די is also used in ch 7 to express a construct relationship between nouns. See vv 4, 6, 7, 10, 19 and 27. Segal, 185, says די and the construct are 'used indiscriminately' in Aramaic to express the genitive.



of the dream of the tree dawned on him. There was an element of the visionary about the interpreter also. It is interesting to note that vv 15 and 28 are both different in the Septuagint from MT. As a result the literary resonances with the Daniel of earlier chapters are not present in 6.

Although Daniel experiences similar physical and mental symptoms to the kings when he dreams, there is an implied contrast with the way he deals with his fears. Whereas the kings are invariably thrown into a panic, the quiet response of Daniel that 'I kept the matter in my heart' (v 28, **נִלְחַת בְּלִבִּי נִסְתַּר**) is of a completely different order. The same contrast this time is present in the Septuagint.

#### links with other stories: bestiality / humanity theme

The interplay between bestial and human also forms a link with the narrative of ch 4.<sup>93</sup> In the earlier chapter, King Nebuchadnezzar was explicitly denied his humanity until such time as he acknowledged the sovereignty of the Most High (4.14). The tree which sheltered the birds and the beasts was cut down and became one from whom the heart of a man was removed and whose lot was with the beasts (4.12f). When he acknowledged God, his humanity returned to him (4.31). These themes re-emerge in ch 7 in a way that is reminiscent of ch 4 but is not a tidy equivalent of it. This time a beast is given 'the heart of a man' (v 4, **לֵב אִישׁ**) in a reversal of Nebuchadnezzar's being given 'the heart of a beast' (4.13, **לֵב חַיָּה**).<sup>94</sup> Even the arrogant little horn at the end of the vision had eyes 'like the eyes of a man' (v 8, **כְּעֵיני אִישׁ**). This makes clear what was only implicit in ch 4, that Nebuchadnezzar's humanity was ultimately derived from God in the same way that the humanity of the beasts belongs to God and is ultimately removed by the heavenly court.<sup>95</sup> Later in the vision of ch 7 the sovereignty exercised

---

<sup>93</sup>Jephet, 34, and Lenglet, 174

<sup>94</sup>Koch, 'Die Weltreiche', 830, notes that the first beast in MT is the only one with a human manner.

<sup>95</sup>Saadia, in Gallé, 72, also links the first beast with Nebuchadnezzar's humanity in ch 4.

by the beasts is removed and given to one 'like a son of man' (v 13, כְּבֶן אָדָם).<sup>96</sup> At this point there is no evidence of any humanity resident in the fourth beast, which is killed and his body destroyed, or in the other three who are allowed to live on. They are described simply as 'the beasts' (v 12, חַיָּוָתָא). Just as Nebuchadnezzar lost his humanity when he refused to acknowledge the source of his authority, so the beasts lose theirs at the judgement scene. We have explored above the strong implication contained in the peil forms of the early part of the chapter that the humanity of the beast derives from God. Nebuchadnezzar also has his humanity returned to him when he sees in ch 4 that heaven rules. There is a further echo here from ch 2 in that Nebuchadnezzar, as symbolized by the great statue, ruled over 'the sons of men' (2.38, בְּנֵי-אָדָם).

The interaction of these themes is not as explicit in the Septuagint. On one hand, as already noted, Θ implies the human quality of speech in the second and third beast, and agrees with MT in v 8 that the little horn of the fourth beast also possesses the facility of speech. The detail of the 'human eyes' (v 8, ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀνθρώπινοι) is also present in Θ. So the beasts are if anything more human than in MT, but only marginally so. They are contrasted with a son of man who is more divine than human, so the interplay between beasts and a human figure (one like a son of man) does not work in quite the same way as in MT.

Once it comes to the link with the themes in ch 4, the explicit vocabulary resonances of the Aramaic are absent in Θ. It is true that the tradition of Nebuchadnezzar eating the food of the beasts and taking on some of the physical characteristics is utilized by the Septuagint (4.15 and 33b). But the more metaphysical notion of his heart being changed to that of a beast is hardly present at all. The one exception is the reference, 'My flesh was changed as well as my heart' (4.33b, ἡλλοιώθη ἡ σὰρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδία μου). Even there the compound subject with a singular verb identifies the change of heart with physical changes. These bodily changes are emphasized by Θ in ch 4 more than the

---

<sup>96</sup>Bevan, 119

Aramaic. For example, in 4.16 ̣ the wish is that the king's 'body be changed by the dew of heaven' (ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀλλοιωθῇ). The Masoretic Text equivalent is that 'his heart be changed from men' (4.13, לִבְנֵה מִן-אִנְשָׁא יִשְׁנֹן). Other occurrences of this concept (MT 4.31 and 33), or the notion that the king's 'lot' (קָלָה) is with the beasts (MT 4.12 and 20), have no equivalent in the Septuagint.

Indeed, the idea of some sort of isolation or exile at times replaces the MT notion of Nebuchadnezzar's bestiality (̣ 4.25f). For example, Nebuchadnezzar relates that at the moment the Most High was acknowledged 'my understanding returned to me' (4.33, מִדְּעִי יָתֻב עָלַי). In a section otherwise uncharacteristically close to MT, the ̣ equivalent is that 'my kingdom was restored to me' (4.36, ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ βασιλεία μου ἐμοί). The extra Septuagintal detail that Nebuchadnezzar would not 'speak with any man' (4.32, οὐ μὴ λαλήσῃς μετὰ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου) also tends in the same direction. This is part of the tendency to allegorize in ̣ ch 4 already discussed, which is seen most clearly in the Septuagint's description of the tree (4.10ff). The net result of these differences in ch 4 is that the literary links between chs 7 and 4 are not as clearly drawn. This is not only the case in terms of vocabulary and theme. As the Masoretic Text stands, the pattern of symbolic vision and interpretation is shared by chs 4 and 7. The extended allegory of ̣ ch 4 does not allow for such an equivalence of structure.

#### **links with other stories: four empires theme**

The autobiographical vision account and the bestiality / humanity axis in ch 7 provide a number of links with chapter 4. The theme of the four empires provides a more obvious tie to ch 2.<sup>97</sup> The relationship of the four empires in each chapter to one another has been debated at length.<sup>98</sup> It is not part of our present purpose to solve the historical question of whether the four kings or empires in mind are the same in each instance. It is enough to note the literary resonances that arise when ch 7 also explores the theme of the four empires.

---

<sup>97</sup>Beasley-Murray, 54

<sup>98</sup>For example Rowley, *Darius the Mede*, 63ff.

In general terms, the writer assesses the four empires similarly in both chapters. Nebuchadnezzar is the head of gold and clearly occupies a position superior to that of the second and third elements of the statue in ch 2 (2.38f). The vision that Daniel has is not so clear on this point, but MT does say of the first beast that he was given the heart of a man (v 4).<sup>99</sup> That does not happen for the second and third beasts, who in fact fade into the background, apart from the problematic reference to them in v 12. Chapter 2 is more explicit that the second and third empires, the silver and bronze of the statue, are not as important as the first empire (v 39). The same attitude to the first three empires is preserved also in the Septuagint. The verses of ch 2 in question are closely translated. The details are slightly different in ch 7, but the effect is largely the same. We have seen that the second and third empires are given a slightly higher profile by ̣ ch 7 in that they are more human than their MT counterparts (vv 5f), but then they disappear from the account entirely. They do not even make the difficult appearance in v 12.

Both visions of the four empires are most interested in the fourth empire, and the eternal kingdom that eventually replaces it.<sup>100</sup> There are striking similarities about the way the fourth empire is portrayed. Ch 7 recalls the feet of iron in ch 2 (2.41) when it describes the fourth beast, although this time as separate elements in the description. The beast has 'teeth of iron' (v 7, שנין די-פּרזל) and it does its evil work 'with its feet' (v 7, ברגליה).<sup>101</sup> The number of the 'ten horns' (v 7, קרנן עשר) may also recall the toes of the feet on the statue (2.42f), although differences between the ̣ and MT traditions about the toes in ch 2 mean that that point cannot be pressed too hard. In his expanded account of the vision Daniel adds the detail that the fourth beast also

---

<sup>99</sup>Driver, 81. Against this, Clerget, 44, identifies the fourth beast with the head of gold.

<sup>100</sup>It is granted that ch 2 sometimes treats the statue as a unity, and sometimes as a symbol of successive regimes. But problems raised by this ambivalence do not jeopardize the literary argument here being offered.

<sup>101</sup>Delcor, *Daniel*, 147

had 'claws of bronze' (v 19, טַפְרֵיהֶם דִּי-נְחָשׁ). The reference to iron and bronze reminds the reader of the four metal tradition central to ch 2, without necessarily implying any logical links as far as interpretation is concerned.<sup>102</sup> The behaviour of the fourth beast is also reminiscent of its counterpart in ch 2. The destructive nature of the iron empire is echoed in ch 7 with the picture of the creature with iron teeth and bronze claws 'eating, crushing and trampling' (vv 7, 19 and 23, אָכַל...רָפְסָה). In particular, the verb דָּקַק is used in both contexts (see 2.40). The divisions within the fourth empire of ch 2 (2.43) are also present in the eleventh horn's humbling of three kings to make room for himself (v 24), although the theme is less prominent in ch 7.<sup>103</sup>

There is a twist in the tail of the imagery with the use of the same verb to describe what happens to the statue when it is struck by the stone not quarried by human hands. The rock 'crushed' (2.34, הִדָּקָה) the feet of the statue, then all the elements of the statue were 'crushed together' (2.35, דָּקָה כְּחֵדָה; see also 2.44) before being scattered to the wind. The image is reversed in that what the fourth empire does to those around it in ch 7 has already happened to that empire in the judgement against it of ch 2. The same sort of resonance comes through the use of the verb אָכַל (vv 7, 19 and 23). The reader is put in mind of the idiom describing the treatment of Daniel and his three friends at the hands of the courtiers in chs 3 and 6. There they 'ate pieces of him' (3.8 and 6.25, אָכְלוּ קְדָצִיהוֹן). The irony of the slanderers' fate in ch 6, that they are eaten by the lions, has been noted. But as well as their being eaten, the lions 'crush' (6.25, הִדָּקָה) their bones, an extra detail that strengthens the resonance of this particular image in ch 7 with what has gone before. The behaviour of the Babylonians has been reversed against them as part of the judgement on them, just as happens to the fourth empire of ch 7.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 157 writes, 'There is no specific reason to suppose that the connection (between ch 7 and chs 2-6) is other than a literary one.'

<sup>103</sup>Bevan, 114. See also Montgomery, *Daniel*, 282.

<sup>104</sup>See Lenglet, 176, on the smashing stone and son of man as complementary images.

Related to the theme of judgement against the four beasts is the strong hint that their sovereignty is something that they are dependent on God for anyway. Just as it is taken away from them, so it was given to them in the first place. We have looked at this effect in the first part of ch 7 in some detail. That also recalls the reminder to Nebuchadnezzar, much more explicitly than in ch 7, that God 'has given' (2.37f, ܕܝܬ) his authority to him and will also take it away.<sup>105</sup> The existence of this story adds to the effect of Daniel's later vision.

As far as the broad outlines of the stories and vision go, the links discernible in the Masoretic Text are also present in the Septuagint. The physical description of the fourth empire, its aggressive behaviour, and the divisions within it are all represented in the Septuagint. The ironies of judgement outlined above may also be discerned. This is not surprising given that ch 2 of ̡ is much closer to MT than ̡ ch 4. But the emphasis on the derived nature of royal authority as a link between the chapters is not as clearly drawn in Septuagint, largely because the distinctive use of ܦܝܠ in the early verses is not well represented in the Greek. And the particular connections through vocabulary are not present to the same extent. Neither v 7 nor v 19 is exactly equivalent in the Septuagint. The nine occurrences of ܦܦܠ in the book (2.34, 35, 40, 44 and 45; 6.25; 7.7, 19 and 23) are translated with several different synonyms, or else not represented at all, so the thread woven by the one Aramaic word is not as evident. We have already seen that the idiomatic expression for slander in the Aramaic of 3.8 and 6.25 is not translated literally by ̡, so the connections made by the word ܐܢܠ are likewise not part of the Septuagint's story.

#### **links with other stories: the final kingdom**

There are also important links between chs 2 and 7 in their view of the kingdom that replaces the vicious fourth kingdom. The final kingdom is not developed to the same extent in ch 2, but the key characteristics of timelessness and indestructibility are conveyed in the phrases, 'it

---

<sup>105</sup>Lenglet, 179



will never be destroyed' (2.44, **לעלמין לא תחבל**) and 'it will be set up forever' (2.44, **תקום לעלמין**). The reign of the son of man, likewise, is 'an eternal rule' (v 14, **שלטן עלם**) which 'will not be destroyed' (v 14, **לא תחבל**). Similar echoes are found in the Septuagint at this point. Just as the authority of the son of man is an 'eternal authority' (v 14, **ἐξουσία αἰώνιος**), so the final kingdom of ch 2 'will be set up forever' (2.44, **στήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**). The recurrence of **חבל** in Aramaic is also paralleled in **Θ** with the verb **φθείρω**. The kingdom represented by the crushing rock will 'not be ruined' (2.44, **οὐ φθαρήσεται**) and the kingdom granted the son of man will likewise will 'never be ruined' (v 14, **οὐ μὴ φθαρή**).

### further literary links with other stories

The points just focused on provide ample evidence on their own in support of the case for understanding Daniel 7 in conjunction with the stories that precede it. But there are also other instances of vocabulary that evoke the earlier stories.<sup>106</sup> The use of **קם** in v 4, where the eagle was stood on its feet, recalls the parody of ch 3 when the statue is constantly referred to as that which 'Nebuchadnezzar set up' (3.2, 3, 5 and 7, **רי הקים נבוכדנאצר**).<sup>107</sup> The horn that 'uprooted' (v 8, **אתעקרו**) three other horns calls to mind the tree of ch 4 which in fact was not quite uprooted. 'Its root stock' (4.12, 20 and 23, **עקר שרשודי**) was allowed to remain against the day that the king's sovereignty and the tree's greatness would be returned. 'All peoples, nations and tongues' (v 14, **כל עממין אנוא ורשין**) is a formula encountered time and again. Apart from the variations on it, it is found in the exact form here quoted in four of the five preceding stories (3.4, 7 and 31; 5.19; 6.26).<sup>108</sup> The vocabulary of **Θ** also creates these resonances, although in the last example there is greater variation in the way the formula

<sup>106</sup>Stefanovic, 'Thematic Links', 125f, sets out in tabular form a number of links between the historical and prophetic sections.

<sup>107</sup>An interesting interplay goes on between 'standing' and 'falling' in Daniel 2-7. Note, for example, that the myriads stand before the Ancient of Days (7.10) while Nebuchadnezzar's officials are required to fall before the statue of ch 3.

<sup>108</sup>Anderson, 86

appears.

### structural links with other stories

There is also a sense in which the very structure of chs 2-7 binds the vision and interpretation of Daniel to the stories about his and his companions' encounters with the sovereigns. We have noted that several of the narratives are shaped to build suspense. They begin with the king's problem, which is either caused or heightened by some sort of divine revelation, and build the expectation that what ensues will solve the problem. The suspense comes in that the meaning or purpose of the divine revelation takes a considerable time to be worked out. Occasionally it is apparently put in the background by the narrator, while he turns the spotlight onto other agenda. Only toward the end of the story is the interpretation or solution offered, or sometimes the exact nature of the problem finally explicated. In chs 2 and 5 the reader must wait to find out what the solution to the riddles might be. In fact, the initial emphasis on the effect of the revelations on the king delays an explanation of the revelation, and its interpretation takes longer still. Even chs 4 and 6 have elements of suspense built into them. The same kind of structure of suspense operates in chs 2-7 as a unit. Daniel 2 begins a revelation of what must take place 'after this' (2.29 and 45, **אחרי כן**). The reader must wait to see the final exposition of these things in ch 7.<sup>109</sup> The more active nature of the empires in ch 7 relative to those in ch 2 is one indication of this process.<sup>110</sup> In the meantime, further dramas are played out between the dream of the statue and the fuller explanation of the four empires. This in itself lends a new significance to the fourth empire and the final kingdom, just as the significance of the writing on the wall was heightened by its absence from the central part of the narrative in ch 5. The stories in between are enlisted to help explore that significance.

---

<sup>109</sup>Goldingay, *Daniel*, 158. Raabe, 273, notes the details in ch 7 that are additional to ch 2. Heaton, 178, calls vv 9-14 the climax of the whole book.

<sup>110</sup>See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 158, who also enumerates other differences between the regimes of chs 2 and 7.

The same observations on structure cannot apply to the Septuagint. In the first place, the individual narratives are not structured for suspense in *Ḡ* to the same extent as in MT. This renders it less likely that a deliberate structural link between the visions of chs 2 and 7 can be read into the Septuagint. There is also the complex question of what an earlier shaping of Daniel may have looked like. P967 places chs 7 and 8 between chs 4 and 5 resulting in a chronological arrangement based on the royal dating in the Old Greek tradition.<sup>111</sup> We noted in the chapter on Daniel 5 that this is possibly the oldest order of the Old Greek, while the MT order arises in a 'heavily redacted composition of the Semitic text'.<sup>112</sup> Whatever view is taken on the composition history of the respective versions, the P967 order creates a different perspective on the relationship of ch 7 to the whole, and strikes a chord with what we have observed about the differences between the *Ḡ* and MT narratives in chs 4 and 5.<sup>113</sup> In the Masoretic Text, ch 7 points towards the visions yet draws on a number of themes in the preceding stories. It also denotes a shift from concerns of exile to issues of nationhood. The organization is more thematic or genre-related than chronological. In P967 chs 4 and 5 can be separated from each other without undue violence to continuity because the concern that binds chs 4 and 5 in the Masoretic Text, the person of Nebuchadnezzar, is largely expressed in MT plus material and so is less prominent in the Old Greek. Chs 3 and 4 in the Septuagint suggest a view of Nebuchadnezzar that owes something to the experience of the Jewish people at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. By placing ch 7 immediately after the stories in chs 2-4 P967 follows up the theme of Nebuchadnezzar as the evil king.<sup>114</sup>

### conclusion

In the nature of the material being treated, I have spent less time

---

<sup>111</sup>Geissen, 33

<sup>112</sup>Lust, 'Daniel 4-5', 9. See also Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 198ff.

<sup>113</sup>The problem of a Hebrew chapter (8) with Aramaic (7 and 5) on either side of it is a weakness in the argument for the originality of P967, which has not been satisfactorily resolved.

<sup>114</sup>Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 206

than previously on the shape of the narrative itself. When the chapter is treated as a literary unit, there is a definite narrative structure discernible, akin to the autobiographical dream account in ch 4. As in chapter 2, there is little difference in the way the Septuagint shapes the story, which is partly why that aspect has not dominated my approach to ch 7. A couple of exceptions have been noted, however. The Aramaic use of passive forms creates a nuance of divine workmanship lying behind events, while the eschatological nature of Daniel's visionary experiences stands out more in the *Ṭ* than in MT. In passing, a couple of instances have been noted where the Septuagint anticipates the narrative, a habit we have observed in its translations of other stories.

The bulk of the chapter has concentrated on the respective understanding and interpretation of Daniel's vision in each version. The chief difficulty in so doing is found in the number of exegetical points that need to be settled in each version before they can be set alongside each other. In particular, I have proceeded on the premise that the Ancient of Days in both versions can be thought of in the same terms as the Most High. In the Masoretic Text the son of man is understood as a human figure who has divine characteristics and privileges invested in him. In the same way that the beasts symbolize four empires, the holy ones of the Most High correspond in the interpretation to the son of man in the vision. They are a group of humans who, like him, are given a divine task.

Many of the differences between the versions can be explained in technical terms and their significance should not be exaggerated. Nevertheless, partly through translation choices and partly through working with a variant *Vorlage*, the Septuagint does exhibit some tendencies. The *Ṭ* takes even less interest in the second and third beasts than does its MT counterpart. The son of man is an inherently divine figure, rather than one who is invested with divinity. As a corollary, the holy ones of the Most High are characterized in more earthly terms. One consequence of that is a difference between the versions in the way symbols are used.

When it comes to the literary relationships between ch 7 and its preceding narratives, MT and the Septuagint have most in common in their

use of the four empire scheme which unites chs 2 and 7. This is not surprising given that the Old Greek translation or its *Vorlage* is closer to MT in those two chapters than elsewhere in Daniel 2-7. Otherwise, the literary resonances binding this vision narrative to the other stories are not as strong in the Septuagint as in the Masoretic Text, sometimes because of a different Aramaic text behind  $\Theta$  and sometimes because themes become lost in translation. The evidence for a coherent structure behind chs 2-7 is also stronger in MT. Indeed there is a suggestion from P967 that the Septuagint follows quite a different ordering, and we have seen hints of that ordering in our discussion of earlier chapters.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### DIFFERENCES IN DANIEL 1 AND 8-12

The purpose of this chapter is to survey in general terms how the Septuagint compares with the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew chapters of Daniel (1, 8-12) as a way of rounding out the comparative study of chapters 2-7. The survey is primarily undertaken as a check on the conclusions that I have reached in previous chapters, and is not intended to solve the multitude of exegetical and theological problems raised by both versions of these complex chapters. Nor is there time to distinguish between differences in the *Vorlage* and those arising in translation, except in tentative terms. I begin by discussing the nature of the Greek translation, and certain renderings which could be problematic. These raise the question of the extent to which the Septuagint interprets its *Vorlage*, and the debate on that subject is alluded to. While there is generally close equivalence in the Greek translation, there are some marked differences in the way each version treats certain key terms, people, places and dates in the chapters under discussion. The central part of my survey focuses on these and, without engaging fully in the debate, suggests that a degree of interpretation is to be found in them. As in ch 7, the differences often do not signify a change in meaning, but sometimes demonstrate a slightly different outlook between versions. Along the way I note a number of instances where tendencies evident in chs 2-7 continue to be present in the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew chapters. The variations that arise do not affect the narrative form of the chapters in question, so that aspect will not be a part of the ensuing discussion.



An extremely rough generalization is that the Septuagint relates to the Hebrew Masoretic Text in Daniel 1 and 8-12 much as it does to the Aramaic Masoretic Text of Daniel 2 and 7. There is an oscillation in the degree of direct equivalence on the part of the Greek translation. Sometimes the equivalence is marked while at other times there are some notable variations. The Hebrew syntax is often tortuous, particularly but not only in ch 11, and this creates difficulty for the translator. Despite those difficulties, at times the equivalence of elements in the Greek translation suggests a translator with considerable respect for his *Vorlage*.<sup>1</sup> Each of the chapters in question displays certain tendencies that distinguish it from its neighbours, but examples of this direct syntactical equivalence can be cited from each. Leaving aside lexical equivalence, the syntactical correspondence is striking in 8.5. The Greek includes the personal pronoun ἐγώ to represent אני, although it makes it the subject of a finite verb rather than the היה plus participle form of MT. והנה and καὶ ἰδοὺ correspond, as do ἐπὶ προσώπου and על-פני. Whatever the phrase might mean, the puzzling הצפיר קרן חזות is retained by Θ with τοῦ τράγου κέρας ἔν.<sup>2</sup> In 9.7 the Hebrew idiom of ל with pronominal suffixes as possessive becomes the dative forms, σοι and ἡμιν, while the כ prefixed to יום is κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν. The phrase in the last part of 10.14 is not elegantly stated in either language, but the same word order is present in each with the standard exception of γὰρ. The Greek word order ἔτι ὄρασις εἰς ἡμέρας is a replication of the Hebrew עוד חזון לימים. Θ 11.3 exactly reproduces the expression מושל ממשל רב ('will rule with great dominion') with κυριεύσει κυρ(ι)είας πολλῆς. Correspondence with the Hebrew emphatic in 12.5, ראיתי אני דניאל (literally 'I saw, I Daniel'), results in the unusual Greek word order, εἶδον ἐγὼ Δανιηλ. Perhaps the point is best illustrated at 11.17, where the Hebrew is nothing if not obscure. Notwithstanding slight alterations in content, the syntax of MT is still reproduced by the Greek.

<sup>1</sup>It is the conclusion of Jeansonne, 131, that 'the OG tries to render faithfully the *Vorlage* into well-constructed Greek prose'.

<sup>2</sup>BHS speculates that ἔν witnesses to אחר rather than חזות.

At the same time there are some marked variations to note. Both versions contain material that is not present in the other. In MT these include the extra detail on dating and the physical description of a rebuilt Jerusalem in 9.25. At 10.9 the Masoretic Text conveys the additional detail that Daniel had 'fallen into a deep sleep' (נרדם). A number of MT pluses appear in ch 11 around the detail of the conflict between the kings of the north and the south. These involve the fate of the daughter (11.6), the presence of a multitude given over to the king of the south (11.11), mention of a ruler of the covenant (11.22), and the role played by the nations of Edom, Moab and Ammon (11.41). Material in the Septuagint additional to MT may be found in the added narrative detail of 8.11, which mentions captives being carried away and the 'eternal hill' (τὰ ὄρη τὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος) broken up. At 9.27 the extra detail of the 'sevens' probably equates to MT 9.25 in some way. The cryptic reference in MT 11.34 to those who stumble and are given a little help, is expanded and intensified in the Septuagint. The conclusion at 12.13 is longer in the Septuagint, with an extra 'rest' (ἀναπαύση) and the promise that the visionary would rise to glory.

Apart from the existence of plus material in both versions, there are numerous small differences between the versions, which can be explained in one of several ways. They either exist in the *Vorlage*, or they arise in translation. Those that arise in translation can either be an attempt at clarification or interpretation on the part of the translator, or are explicable as some sort of misreading of the Hebrew text. It is seldom possible to distinguish with certainty between these types of variations, and there is an ongoing debate as to how the variations should be regarded. A number of commentators view the Septuagint in these chapters as interpretational to some degree.<sup>3</sup> An extreme statement in the same direction is found in McCrystall who says the peculiarities of *Θ* can only be accounted for as 'the activity of someone who was translating from a deliberate standpoint'.<sup>4</sup> Others are

---

<sup>3</sup>For example Bruce, 'Earliest Old Testament Interpretation', 37ff, van der Kooij, 72ff, or Beckwith, 'Daniel 9', 527f.

<sup>4</sup>McCrystall, 93

more cautious about the extent of interpretation in the Septuagint.<sup>5</sup> In concluding her exhaustive text critical study of Daniel 7-12, Jeansonne says that 'the OG translator did not undertake the work with a particular agenda' and would not have held a translation to be 'the proper forum for the theological interpretation of the readings of the sacred text'.<sup>6</sup> Jeansonne and McCrystall represent opposite ends of the spectrum in this particular debate.

Not surprisingly, the difficult nature of ch 11 produces the most examples of the different types of variation, but they are also present in the other chapters. Whatever the significance of the difference, the Θ characterization of the four young Jews as 'from the nation of the sons of Israel from those of Judea' (1.6, ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας) probably reflects some kind of expansion on 'from the sons of Judah' (מְבִנֵי יְהוּדָה) in the *Vorlage*. The effect is to identify the Judahite youths with the nation as a whole, and also to identify Israel and Judah. This nationalistic tendency in the Septuagint of Daniel has also been discerned elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> It is possible that the extra phrase 'for the sons of your people' (8.19, τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ σου) has similar origins.<sup>8</sup> Several variations in 9.26 are unlikely to have risen in the process of translation, as both versions contain plus material. The Masoretic Text has the extra modification of the leader as one 'who is coming' (הַבָּא), as well as the final emphatic 'desolations are decreed' (וְהָרָצָה שְׁמֹמֶת). At the same time the Septuagint includes 'the anointed one' (τοῦ χριστοῦ) with the victims of destruction. The Hebrew of ch 11 is so difficult that it is seldom possible to be certain whether Θ is following a different tradition or simply making the best of a bad job.

---

<sup>5</sup>For example Hanhart, 342.

<sup>6</sup>Jeansonne, 133

<sup>7</sup>Clines, 146f, discerns a similar movement in Esther. He identifies two Esther stories, the 'Esther tale' and the 'Mordecai tale'. The latter is central to the earlier A Text and is about a Jew, particularly a Benjamite (AT Esth 1.1). The former, in which Mordecai is no longer a Benjamite, transforms the story to one about the Jews and events that help define Jewish self-identity.

<sup>8</sup>But note that Montgomery, *Daniel*, 352, calls this a 'correct exegetical plus', an assessment with which Jeansonne, 69, agrees.

But the reference in 11.27 to two kings who 'dine alone' (μόνοι δειπνήσουσιν) seems to owe something to a variant *Vorlage*. A final example in 12.3 concerns the role of the shining ones who either 'keep / hold fast my word' (Θ, κατισχύοντες τοὺς λόγους μου) or 'turn many to righteousness' (מצדיקי הרבים).<sup>9</sup>

Other differences could be the result of a Greek translator clarifying an obscure Hebrew *Vorlage*. That seems to be happening where the neutral Hebrew term מראה (1.13, 'appearance') is applied to the youths by MT. The Septuagint specifies the concern about their appearance that it should not be 'enervated' (διατετραμμένη). In 9.23 Θ makes quite clear with a small plus that the decree which went out was 'from the Lord' (παρὰ κυρίου).

However, most differences in meaning are more readily explained by the difference in semantic range of the Hebrew word and the Greek one chosen to translate it. As a result the meaning is slightly skewed.<sup>10</sup> The examples of this are numerous, but a small selection will be adduced in illustration. The first comes from 8.25 where the Hebrew reads 'and suddenly he will destroy many' (ובשלה ישחית רבים). The Septuagint equivalent is, 'and by deceit he will do away with many' (καὶ δόλῳ ἀφανιεῖ πολλοὺς). Both δόλῳ and ἀφανιεῖ are possible renderings of the Hebrew, but are unusual and result in a slight difference in meaning. The expected rendering of שלה as it is used in this context is ἐξάπινα, the choice made in 11.21 and 24. However, that meaning of שלה is an extension of its basic sense of ease and prosperity, just as the notion of deception can be seen as an extension of the semantic range of שלה in a different direction.<sup>11</sup> The result is a slightly different view of the methods of this particular king. Similarly, ἀφανίζω is usually employed to translate שמוד (Θ 11.44, Θ 7.26, 9.26 and 11.44), which seems to carry

---

<sup>9</sup>The translation preferred by Charles, *Daniel*, 331. But Montgomery, *Daniel*, 473 thinks Θ has misread the Hebrew as מוזיקי רבי. It is also conceivable that the use of κατισχύω is an attempt to represent מוזיקי רבי.

<sup>10</sup>Hanhart, 342, considers that Θ is at times interpretational in the sense that 'a decision is made between various possibilities of understanding which are already inherent in the formulation of the Hebrew *Vorlage*'.

<sup>11</sup>See the discussion on שלה in Koehler and Baumgartner, 973.

the sense of being reduced to nothing. By extension, its connotations are nearly always destructive. In this instance the Hebrew is שָׁחַ, a word meaning destruction or corruption or ruination. The translator has applied part of the range of ἀφανίζω in using it to translate שָׁחַ. Another small but typical example is found in the last word of MT 10.6, הַמִּוֶּן. The sense is of the type of roar engendered by a large number of something, usually people. Hence the translator must choose whether the sound made by the being in Daniel's revelation is simply an uproar, or an uproar that implies the presence of a multitude. The Septuagint opts for the former with θορύβου while Θ chooses the latter with ὄχλου.

A more extensive example of the same type occurs in 11.20, where the first part of the verse varies in meaning at least partly because the Greek translator has misread an ambiguous piece of Hebrew. The Masoretic Text may be roughly translated, 'and one who causes an exactor (of tribute) to pass through the splendour of the kingdom will stand in his place'. The Septuagint reads, again roughly translated, 'and out of its root a shoot of a kingdom will stand unto standing'. In the expression עַל-כֵּנוֹ ('in his place'), ט has read כֵּנָה, 'root stock', hence the Greek ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης αὐτοῦ. Similarly הַדָּר ('splendour') has been read as הַדֶּרֶךְ, which can also carry the sense of fruitfulness. The result is φυτὸν in the translation. The function of הַדָּר מַלְכוּת is syntactically ambiguous, but context suggests it is the object of the participle מַעֲבִיר. The same ambiguity is present in the Greek equivalent, φυτὸν βασιλείας, but this time sense requires it to function as a subject. The translator is perhaps aware that formal equivalence has not quite delivered a coherent result in this instance, so the additional phrase 'a man smiting the glory of the king' (ἄνηρ τύπτων δόξαν βασιλέως) is designed to convey what he thinks the Hebrew may have intended. Certainly the plus corrects the meaning towards the most probable reading of the Hebrew, namely that the glory of the kingdom is in jeopardy. This one example illustrates the mixture of interpretation and misreading that is characteristic of Θ in Daniel 1 and 8-12.

#### translations of particular words

It is worth noting in passing that there are some surprising translations, which cannot count as misreadings or a different tradition,

because the Septuagint is consistent in its use of them. One example of such is the translation of עת ('time') with ὥρα ('hour'), which first happens in 8.17. This seems like a more specific term than the general concept behind עת warrants. However, by translating in the same way in 9.21, 11.35 and 40, and 12.1, ̔ invests the term with a certain amount of eschatological significance for the purposes of translating the Hebrew sections of Daniel. Exceptions to this are the three-fold use of ἡμέρα in 12.1 and the more conventional choice of καιρός in 12.4. Interestingly, this usage does not feature when the Aramaic ערן is translated.

We saw on more than one occasion in the central chapters of this study that the Septuagint had trouble with geographical or administrative terms in the Aramaic. In that connection we detected that ̔ understood χώρα less specifically than MT understood מדינה in the Persian context. In translating the Hebrew sections also, ̔ uses χώρα in a very broad sense. Only once, in 8.2, is it used to translate מדינה. Of its eight other uses, seven translate ארץ (9.7; 11.16, 19, 28, 40, 41 and 42) and one translates אדם (11.39). This broader understanding helps to explain the inconsistent usage when the Aramaic stories were being translated.

Another apposite example is found where the Masoretic Text refers to Daniel as 'treasured one' (חֲמוּדָה). Whenever the word is applied to Daniel, ̔ translates with ἐλεεινός (9.23; 10.11 and 19), whereas when it describes inanimate objects the Old Greek reads one of the forms of ἐπιθυμία (10.3; 11.38 and 43). A difficult Hebrew usage is the word פת־בג, which means something like 'fine food' and appears in several slightly different forms. Apart from its translation with τραπέζης in 1.5, the word is consistently represented in ̔ chapter 1 with δεῖπνον (1.8, 13, 15 and 16). Its one appearance in the later chapters, 11.26, has no parallel in the Septuagint.

### **differing traditions represented in the Septuagint?**

There are certain words or concepts that the Septuagint seems not to represent exactly, either because it reflects a different tradition or because it finds their meaning obscure. One such is the strange phrase ארץ־הצבי ('the land of beauty'), abbreviated in 8.9 to הצבי. On that



occasion ὅ renders it as 'north', perhaps taking his cue from 8.4. It is not represented at all in the ὅ Greek of 11.16 and 41. The one occasion when it is translated is in 11.45 (θελήσεως). The word צָבִי also appears in Ez 20.6 and 15, also inexactly translated with κηρίον.

Another is the term מִעוֹ, which MT also uses in conjunction with מִבְצָר in ch 11. The Hebrew writer of Daniel uses the two terms virtually synonymously, which they are where the semantic ranges of 'place of refuge' (מִעוֹ) and 'fortified place' (מִבְצָר) overlap. The Septuagint is not quite sure what to do with them, but often takes the sense of the words as expressing functions of cities. In 11.10 it translates מִעוֹ with 'city' (πόλις). In 11.19 it uses χώρα, but paradoxically translates מִדִּינָה with πόλις in 11.24. The term מִבְצָר is also translated with πόλις in 11.24. The portmanteau phrase מִבְצָרֵי מִעוֹת (11.39) has a double representation in ὅ. It is both πόλεων and the more literal ὀχύρωμα ἰσχυρὸν. The Masoretic Text speaks of a 'fortified city' (עִיר מִבְצֻרָה) in 11.15, and on that occasion the Septuagint translates literally with τὴν πόλιν τὴν ὀχυράν. Strangely the ὅ equivalent of מִעוֹ in 11.31 is ἅγιον ('holy things'), which is hardly a translation at all. There may be a lacuna in the Greek, but if there is, it cannot be the feminine πόλις, modified as it is by ἅγιον. Unfortunately P967 is unable to help at this point.

### translation of key terms

The Septuagint betrays a slightly different understanding of several key terms or concepts in its translations of the Hebrew chapters. A number of commentators have identified as significant a group called the 'maskilim' (הַמְשַׁכִּלִּים), the 'wise / understanding ones' or 'teachers'. The consistency with which this participial noun occurs, as well as the finite forms of the verb שָׁכַל, suggests an identifiable group in the mind of the writer.<sup>12</sup> Theodotion normally translates both the nominal and verbal forms with the verb συνίημι or its cognate σύνεσις (1.4; 9.13 and

---

<sup>12</sup>Davies, *Daniel*, 121f, and Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 168f and 210f. Hartman and DiLella, 309, also speak of a 'specific group'. But others such as Goldingay, *Daniel*, 308f, and Montgomery, *Daniel*, 471, prefer a more generalized interpretation.

25; 11.33 and 35; 12.3 and 10). The only exceptions are in 1.17 and 9.22. However, even Theodotion does not recognize the uniqueness of the Hebrew term as it uses the same words to translate forms of **בין**, a more common occurrence in the Hebrew chapters. The Septuagint treats **שכל** even less distinctively. Whereas **בין** or its cognate is consistently translated by a form of *διανοέομαι* in *Θ* (8.5, 15, 23 and 27; 9.2; 10.12; 11.30; 12.8), the translator does not distinguish between *συνίημι* (1.17, 11.35 and 12.3) and *διανοέομαι* (9.13 and 25; 12.10) when translating **שכל**. It looks as though, unlike some subsequent commentators, he does not understand the term **נושכלים** generically.

At whatever stage it may have arisen, there is also a variation in the way the Septuagint treats the heavenly beings as they are presented in MT. A small but familiar example is in 1.2 where 'the treasure house of his (Nebuchadnezzar's) gods' (**בית אוצר אלהיו**) is 'his idol temple' (*εἰδωλίω*).<sup>13</sup> The difference is one that is typical in the Septuagint, and continues a tendency noted in its translation of the Aramaic chapters.

More problematical is *Θ*'s portrayal of the heavenly beings that Daniel encounters, especially in chs 10 and 11, and where the Hebrew uses **שר**. That word routinely denotes earthly authorities, but here strongly implies other-worldly beings.<sup>14</sup> When he appears Michael is described as 'one of the chief princes' (10.13, **אחד השרים הראשנים**) and later as 'your prince' (10.21, **שרכם**). In 12.1 he is 'the great prince' (**השר הגדול**). The Septuagint explicitly recognizes Michael as an angelic figure in two of those instances. At 10.21 the translation is simply 'the angel' (*ὁ ἄγγελος*), while in *Θ* 12.1 Michael is 'the great angel' (*ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας*). In 10.13 'one of the chief princes' is expressed by *εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν πρώτων*, a phrase which is not so explicit. Nevertheless *ἄρχων* is a common and wide ranging word which denotes earthly or heavenly beings according to context. In fact, its semantic range is similar to that of **שר**, and is used accordingly by Theodotion to translate every instance of **שר** in Daniel (1.7, 9, 10, 11 and 18; 8.11; 9.6; 10.13 and

<sup>13</sup> McCrystall, 91, attributes this rendering to the influence of Jer.12.16f.

<sup>14</sup> 'Angel princes in the court of heaven', according to Caird, 238.

20f; 11.5; 12.1). Unlike Theodotion,  $\Theta$  has clarified the angelic status of Michael.

The Septuagint diverges more markedly from MT at the references in 10.13 and 20 to 'the prince of Persia' ( $\text{שׂר מלכות פרס}$  in 10.13,  $\text{שׂר פרס}$  in 10.20) and 'the prince of Greece' (10.20,  $\text{שׂר יון}$ ). The heavenly messenger of MT describes these beings in the same terms as for Michael, and a celestial battle seems to be implied.<sup>15</sup> However, the terminology of the  $\Theta$  translation differs in that these princes of Greece and Persia are seen as  $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\iota$  ('leaders / commanders'). This is a more explicit term than  $\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$ , and its referent is almost inevitably to political or military leadership. In Daniel it translates  $\text{שׂר}$  in the list of officials in 3.2. It translates  $\text{שׂר}$  three other times in the Septuagint (1 Ki 29.3f, 1 Chr 11.6 and 2 Chr 32.21), and each time the context is secular. In the last named verse  $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\nu$  is an item in the list of Assyrian leaders who are subjected to the activity of an 'angel' ( $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ ) sent by the Lord. Other words translated with  $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  are normally to do with human leaders. See for example its occurrence as an equivalent to  $\text{סגן}$  in Jer 28/51 (vv 23, 28 and 57) and Ez 23 (vv 6, 12 and 23). Not surprisingly, the numerous instances in the first two books of the Maccabees are all political or military. In the book of Daniel itself there are also many uses of  $\text{שׂר}$  in the sense of a human figure, notably in relation to the eunuch of ch 1 (vv 7, 9, 10, 11 and 18) but also in 9.6 and 8, and 11.5. There the Septuagint translates with the more multi-faceted  $\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu$  (in ch 1) or  $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  (9.6 and 8; 11.15).

The choice of vocabulary in the Septuagint suggests that the Greek translator regarded the Princes of Persia and Greece as human figures, and so interpreted an ambiguous *Vorlage* in a particular direction. This incidentally raises the same question about the nature of the interaction between the cosmic and the human as was raised by the translation of ch 7. There the holy ones of the Most High were more earthly in the

---

<sup>15</sup>That is the more commonly held view. See for example Keil, 416, Lacocque, *Daniel*, 156, and Montgomery, *Daniel*, 411. Note also Gallé, 121, where Ibn-Ezra and Rashi both take the prince of Persia to be a heavenly figure. Shea, 'Prince of Persia', 235, calls on Calvin in support of his view that the Prince is a human figure. He specifies Cambyses, son of and co-regent with Cyrus.

Septuagint and the son of man more divine. Here too there is a sharper distinction made between heavenly beings and the temporal events with which they are concerned.<sup>16</sup>

The Septuagint version's concern for the nation and cult of Israel in the Daniel narratives also emerges to a limited extent in the chapters now under review. This is most evident in ch 9. 'Your sanctuary' (9.17, **מקדשך**) is localized and emphasized in **Θ** with 'your holy hill' (τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν σου). The emphasis is even stronger at 9.19 and 24, in both of which verses 'Zion' (Σιών) is a Septuagint plus in apposition to 'your (holy) city' (**עיר קדש**) in Daniel's prayer. Similarly in 9.25 another **Θ** plus describes Jerusalem as 'a city to the Lord' (πόλιν κυρίου). All of these elements are present also in the Masoretic Text, but are underscored in the Septuagint. The more nationalist description of the young men of **Θ** ch 1 already alluded to is part of the same phenomenon.

The last citation above, which contains κύριος in a plus, also brings out a characteristic of **Θ** as a whole. The Septuagintal tendency to use 'Lord' instead of or as well as 'God' has already been explored. It is sufficient to point out the same tendency in the translation of the Hebrew chapters of Daniel. Notwithstanding the reverse case in 9.19, κύριος is a plus in 9.16, 23 and 25 as well as 10.12, and δεσπότης is a substitute for **אלהים** in 9.17.

### treatment of people

The versions also exhibit variant understandings of several key figures that appear in the Hebrew chapters. The first such is met at 1.20 where MT tells us that Daniel and his companions are ten times better than 'all the magicians and enchanters' (**כל חכמים ואשפים**) in Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. The Septuagint, however, finds them ten times 'wiser' (σοφωτέρους) than 'the wise men and philosophers' (τοὺς σοφιστὰς καὶ τοὺς φιλοσόφους) in the kingdom. A direct qualitative comparison of

---

<sup>16</sup>Niditch, 227f, makes a similar distinction in the way symbols are used between chs 7 and 8 in MT. In her view the images of ch 8 'are far less subtle and artistically complex'. The same might be said of **Θ** images with respect to MT.

the type in MT implies that Daniel occupies the same category as the Babylonian officials.  $\mathfrak{G}$  is unhappy with the view of Daniel as one of a kind with the mantic officials, and shifts the category to one more in keeping with his status as an Israelite wise man. This is also an aspect of  $\mathfrak{G}$ 's translation of the Aramaic section.<sup>17</sup> The extra  $\text{ἔδωκε}$  in 1.17 works in the same way to give Daniel a role that is unique amongst the four Jewish youths, just as the Septuagint of 2.17f saw Daniel in a position superior to his three companions.

There are several variations in the dating and naming of the kings Darius and Cyrus. In 1.21 a Septuagint plus reminds us that Cyrus is 'king of Persia' ( $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \Pi\epsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\omega}\nu$ ). Later on at 11.1 'Darius the Mede' of the Masoretic Text is 'Cyrus the king' in  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Moreover the events of ch 10 are said by the Septuagint to take place in the first year of Cyrus, and not the third as claimed by MT. There is an argument arising out of the last verse of ch 6 that the intention of MT is to identify the figures of Darius and Cyrus with each other. Wiseman initially proposed this idea as a historical reality based on the grammar of 6.29, and more recently this identification has been supported at least as a literary device in MT, regardless of questions about its historicity.<sup>18</sup> The differences signalled above make that impossible for the Septuagint. Even in  $\mathfrak{G}$  6.29 the two figures are clearly distinguished from each other, and Darius disappears altogether in 11.1. In a move towards a correct ordering of events, the Septuagint puts both chapters 10 and 11 in the first year of Cyrus.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless the existence of a Median empire preceding the Persian still exists in the dating of ch 9 in both versions. The father of Darius, whether Ahasuerus or Xerxes, is the same figure under different nomenclature. The order of empires is still implied by the chronological ordering of the chapters in P967.

---

<sup>17</sup>In this connection Montgomery, *Daniel*, 138, notes that the  $\mathfrak{G}$  plus material of 1.20 and 3.30/97 have the same effect as each other on the role of the young men.

<sup>18</sup>See again the arguments of Wiseman, 'Some Historical Problems', 15f, and Colless, 123ff, noted in connection with Daniel 6.

<sup>19</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 418. According to McCrystall, 272, the change of year in 10.1 is to bring the date into line with 1.21.

Another person whose treatment differs slightly but not significantly between versions is the court official of ch 1 with whom Daniel and his friends have most of their dealings. The difference in name, 'Ashpenaz' or 'Abiesdri' (1.3, אֲשְׁפַנָּז or Αβιεςδρι), is explicable in technical terms and is consistent throughout (see 1.11 and 16).<sup>20</sup> Whether this figure is actually a eunuch or simply a court official, the Septuagint translates literally throughout with ἀρχιευνοῦχος. Until v 10 both versions present the chief eunuch as the one with whom the young Hebrews deal directly. However 1.11 introduces a 'keeper' (מִלְצָד) who comes between the men and the chief of the eunuchs. The Septuagint becomes confused by describing Abiesdri as the keeper 'appointed by the chief eunuch' (τῷ ἀναδειχθέντι ἀρχιευνούχῳ), where earlier in the chapter he was the chief eunuch himself.

### treatment of geographical terms

There are some problems in the Septuagintal treatment of the points of the compass in ch 8. In 8.4 a ram is pictured butting against the west, north and south, which implies that the power represented by the ram is an eastern one. That implication is lost in 8 where all four points of the compass are listed. Ultimately the western power, Greece, prevails over the ram (8.7f). Later the small horn arising out of this kingdom prevails in a southerly and easterly direction and presumably in Palestine (8.9). Somewhat illogically, the Septuagint in the same place records it striking against the south, west and north, the same three directions mentioned in MT 8.4 as the frontiers of the former power, the Persians. Both 8.4 and 8.9 in the Masoretic Text suggest a level of intentionality in the description of direction, which for some reason has not been represented by the Septuagint or its *Vorlage*.<sup>21</sup> Why that should be so is a matter for conjecture. Jeansonne argues with some success that the explanation is technical rather than historiographic.<sup>22</sup> Whatever the case may be, it does not reflect a difference in how the role of the

---

<sup>20</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 124

<sup>21</sup>Jeansonne, 108

<sup>22</sup>Jeansonne, 104ff,



crucial fourth kingdom is viewed, even if it could hint at a different understand of how that role was applied geographically.

There are some differences in the naming of countries, most of which do not signify a variation in the ways the versions in question understand events. There are two such in ch 11, firstly where 'ships of Kittim' (11.30, כִּיִּים) is translated as 'the Romans' (Ῥωμαῖοι) and secondly where 'the Cushites' (11.43, כּוּשִׁים) are identified as 'Ethiopians' (Αἰθίοπες).<sup>23</sup> The כִּיִּים occur seldom in Biblical Hebrew, and when they do they are normally transliterated by the Greek. See for example Num 24.24, which has been suggested as the source of this midrashic reference in Dan 11.30.<sup>24</sup> Only here is it translated as Romans. In its ancient sense, the word Kittim described the inhabitants of Kition on Cyprus, and was later applied to Cyprus itself and then the western coastlands and islands generally. The westerly reference also came to include Macedonia, as witnessed to in 1 Mac 1.1 and 8.5, and later Jewish tradition identified Kittim with Rome.<sup>25</sup> Vermes explains both the Greek and Roman applications of Kittim as an expression used by Jewish writers from the second century BCE onwards to signify the world power of the day.<sup>26</sup> The Septuagint translator perhaps draws on that same tradition, and clarifies from his own knowledge of Antiochus Epiphanes' campaigns that Rome was intended. The biblical Cush probably refers to the southern Nile region, and was almost universally understood as Ethiopia in the Septuagint (for example in Gen 2.13 and Ez 29.10). The translator of Daniel 11 shares that understanding. A further case involves the rendering of כִּי as Greece (8.21, 10.20 and 11.2). As with the previously mentioned instance, this identification was so commonly understood that even Theodotion follows it. Other biblical examples may be found in Jl 4.6 and Zech 9.13.

---

<sup>23</sup>van der Kooij, 74, takes the former as an example of interpretation.

<sup>24</sup>Hartman and DiLella, 270. Bruce, 'Prophetic Interpretation', 23, says the ships of Kittim reference indicates that the events of 168 BCE were seen as the fulfillment of Num 24.24. See also Hanhart, 361.

<sup>25</sup>Hartman and DiLella, 270

<sup>26</sup>Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 28f. For example, 1QpHab VI.3-5 applies the term to Rome.

Roughly the same area of land and body of people is understood by both versions in the instances above. The Septuagint is a little more interpretative in its treatment of 'the king of the south' (מלך-הנגב) in ch 11. Wherever that phrase occurs, the Septuagint reads 'Egypt' (11.5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 25, 29 and 40). There is no biblical tradition about the south to explain the persistence of that identification, but towards the end of the chapter it becomes clear in MT that the conquering northerner would include Egypt in his fiefdom (11.42f). Indeed the syntax of MT 11.42 emphasizes Egypt among the defeated lands. It is possible that the ̳ translator has taken his lead from these verses and read Egypt back into the earlier references to the south.<sup>27</sup> As with his reference to Rome, there may also be an element of clarification towards the translator's own view of the political events behind ch 11.<sup>28</sup>

### the daughter

In connection with the same events, the figure of a daughter crops up twice in the Masoretic Text of ch 11. In 11.6 the daughter of the king of the south goes north to make an alliance. In the Septuagint the king of Egypt goes north and an alliance is made with the same unsatisfactory results, but the role of his daughter as an instrument in the alliance is not mentioned. In 11.17 there is also a daughter, this time in both versions, but in MT she is a 'daughter of women' (בת הנשים) where ̳ describes her as a 'daughter of man' (θυγατέρα ἀνθρώπου). In the schema of ch 11 as a whole, each reference is generally thought to apply to a different event.<sup>29</sup> The first alliance took place in the mid third century BCE when the Seleucid Ptolemy II married his daughter Berenice to

---

<sup>27</sup>That is the view of Bruce, 'Earliest Old Testament Interpretation', 43. Hanhart, 356f, considers the ̳ rendering of 11.29 shows a detailed knowledge of the Egyptian campaign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

<sup>28</sup>Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 200, sees a pro-Egyptian author. McCrystall, 385, would go further and see in the 'Egypt' readings evidence of an anti-Seleucid pro-Ptolemaic translator. Jeansonne, 119ff, concedes no political bias in the ̳ translator.

<sup>29</sup>See for example Goldingay, *Daniel*, 296ff, on the historical events behind ch 11.

Antiochus II with ultimately disastrous results. 11.17 probably refers to a later Ptolemy-Seleucid alliance with the betrothal of Cleopatra to Ptolemy V (197 BCE). Given the Septuagint's apparent close interest in Egypt in this chapter, it is surprising that it does not include the detail of the daughter in 11.6.<sup>30</sup> The difference in 11.17 is less significant, and can perhaps be explained as a misreading of **וְנָשִׁים** for the masculine **אֲנָשִׁים**.<sup>31</sup> In neither case do the differences suggest a variation in interpretation of events behind ch 11. However, it is worth noting that **ᾠ** 2.43 is less easily suggestive of intermarriage within the fourth kingdom than its MT equivalent.

#### dating in 9.24-27

The eschatological time frame proposed by both versions is similar except at one point, namely 9.24-27. The Masoretic Text asserts that seventy sevens have been determined upon the people and the city (9.24). What follows immediately is a break down of the 70 into three different periods. The first is of 7 sevens and the next is of 62 sevens duration (9.25). The following verse is devoted to events at the end of this second period, before turning its attention to the one remaining seven left out of the seventy. 9.27 describes something that happens halfway through that final seven. The Septuagint is identical in 9.24 with its reference to 70 sevens. But in 9.25 there is no reference to the first two periods of 7 and 62. Where MT speaks of what will happen after the 62 sevens in 9.26, **ᾠ** speaks of what will be 'after 7 and 70 and 62'. The Greek does not use the numbers to qualify any particular type of span of time, but one is presumably to be understood. **ᾠ** 9.27 includes a substantial amount of plus material. There is reference to the end of the seven, but no mention of the middle of the seven. In addition the Old Greek repeats the 77 and 62, but this time they are 77 'times' (**καίρους**) and 62 'years' (**ἔτη**).

---

<sup>30</sup> McCrystall, 325, points out from 2.43 that the translator would have known about the marriage alliance. His explanation, as part of his pro-Ptolemy thesis, that the translator wished at this point to highlight the Egyptian army has received little support.

<sup>31</sup> Montgomery, *Daniel*, 442

There are two possible approaches to this problem. The one adopted by Jeansonne is that all the differences can be explained by 'plausible misreading of the Hebrew text and by later shifting of phrases'.<sup>32</sup> Therefore no theological or interpretational significance can be attached to the differences. A second approach typified by Montgomery is that the 77 and 62 of the Septuagint in fact may represent the 139th year of the Seleucid era, and is therefore a deliberate dating of the events in question.<sup>33</sup> He is not certain, however, whether the translator's achievement is intentional or accidental. Bruce is less tentative and takes Montgomery's argument further when he sees deliberate theological interpretation in the Septuagint numbers. In his view the date 139 in the Seleucid era would be the time when the anointed one, the high priest Onias III, was removed (171 BCE).<sup>34</sup>

The Septuagint as it stands is not particularly coherent in its use of numbers. Both versions represent 9.24 as an overview of events subsequently detailed in 9.25-27.<sup>35</sup> As part of its overview, 9 agrees with the Masoretic Text about the 70 sevens. It is also possible that a word has been misread as a number 7 rather than a period of time, 'seven', to produce the 77, and that there has been some misplacement of material between 9.25 and 9.26, as well as some duplication of material into 9.26 in the Septuagint.<sup>36</sup> In either instance the anointed one has his locus in the cult or nation of Israel. Since the culminating action of the period in 9.24 is 'to anoint' (למשח) the holy of holies, it is likely that the 'anointed one' (משח) of 9.25f MT is also understood in

---

<sup>32</sup>Jeansonne, 130. But note the criticism by David, 280, of her treatment of this passage.

<sup>33</sup>Montgomery, *Daniel*, 395. See also David, 297.

<sup>34</sup>Bruce, 'Earliest Old Testament Interpretation', 44f. McCrystall, 253, agrees with Bruce but identifies the date with the deposition of Jason by Antiochus IV.

<sup>35</sup>Payne, 97

<sup>36</sup>Beckwith, 'Daniel 9', 527f, says the Septuagint is an interpretation but admits that it therefore perpetrated an 'extraordinary corruption' of the text in doing so. Bruce, 'Earliest Old Testament Interpretation', 44, also admits 'an astonishing alteration of the original text'.

those cultic terms.<sup>37</sup> Those who attach a chronological significance to the 77 and 62 of the Septuagint are compelled to take a less cultic and more nationalistic, if not messianic, view of what or who is intended by the anointed one. However the difference came about, the figure understood by the Septuagint is markedly different from that portrayed in the Masoretic Text, in a way reminiscent of the two views of the son of man in ch 7.

### conclusion

Jeansonne makes the case well that there is no theological *Tendenz* inherent in the Old Greek translation. Her study is a cautionary reminder that significance should not be seen where none was intended. In that regard, many divergences between MT and the Septuagint have technical explanations, either in the *Vorlage* itself or in the process of translation. At times, as with the use of the word *χώρα*, they evidence the same difficulties as were encountered in our study of the Aramaic chapters. Yet, although others have sometimes taken their case for interpretation in *Ἔ* too far, there are points at which it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Septuagint represents a variant tradition. The understanding of gods as idols and the use of *κύριος* are typical of the Septuagint as a whole. The emphasis on Egypt in ch 11 is particular to the translation of the Hebrew chapters in Daniel. The maskilim, whom some would argue lie behind the whole of the book of Daniel, appear to be a more distinct group or class in MT than the Septuagint in these last few chapters. If there is an attempt in MT to harmonize the persons of Darius and Cyrus into one, a case by no means proven, that has not been understood by the Septuagint translator who keeps them distinct while preserving the MT tradition of a prior Median empire. Other aspects of the Septuagint reflect tendencies already discerned in Daniel 2-7. *Ἔ* emphasizes the Israelite nation and cult more than its Hebrew counterpart, and is still anxious to delineate between the wisdom exercised by Daniel and that of the heathen officials. Finally, the

---

<sup>37</sup>But Beckwith, 'Daniel 9', 522, notes that Theodotion among others treats the 7 and 62 weeks as a single period at the end of which the anointed one comes. In his view this more messianic outlook was lost in MT at the time the Masoretic punctuation of the Hebrew text reached its present form. See also McComiskey, 19.

subtlety and ambiguity of the interaction in MT between heaven and earth, symbol and symbolized, is less evident in the Septuagint, which prefers to keep the two separate.



## CHAPTER NINE

### CONCLUSION

#### **reasons for variations**

The question has recurred throughout this study whether or not the differences in the Septuagint arise in translation or were present in the *Vorlage* from which  $\mathfrak{G}$  was translating. It is often impossible to tell, but examples of both types of variation can be detected. In general terms, the probability is that the Septuagint translates the text in front of it relatively literally. We began the thesis on that supposition, based on the work of others, and nothing has come to light to disturb the assumption. Where there are significant differences between the texts, these are therefore likely to have arisen in the *Vorlage*. The considerable narrative differences that result must then be due in some measure to a less carefully crafted Semitic form of the stories. That in turn relates to the probability that the  $\mathfrak{G}$  *Vorlage* predates the form of Daniel 2-7 as preserved by the Masoretes, a point on which I will comment more fully below.

There are however some differences that are more likely to have arisen as a result of the nature of the translation, and these too have had an effect on the narrative as translated. Sometimes they come about simply through a disparity in semantic range between languages, but there are other times when the translator seeks to clarify what he sees as a difficulty in the Aramaic text. Sometimes the perceived difficulty is technical and at other times it is theological. One particular recurring manifestation of this is translation which anticipates subsequent developments in the Masoretic Text narrative. An important example is found in ch 7 where the son of man is treated as though the divinity

endowed on him in 7.14 was already there in 7.13. Chapter 4 is also translated very much in the light of the visions in the second part of Daniel.

As a result, our conclusion differs somewhat from that of Jeansonne that there is no theological *Tendenz* discernible in the translator of the Old Greek.<sup>1</sup> In focusing particularly on chs 7-12 she finds that differences between the versions can almost always be explained as translational or textual problems, or as a different *Vorlage*. Her point is taken that most differences probably arose in the *Vorlage*, particularly in the chapters that she investigates. That is to be expected as *Vorlage* and translation of chs 7-12 are much closer to one another in time and provenance than is the case in chs 2-6. But there are numerous occasions in chs 2-7 where the translator betrays a particular mind-set, which also follows through into the later chapters.<sup>2</sup> The suspicion of kings who usurp divine privileges and concern for the temple sacrifices are cases in point. Even where variations arise from incompatible semantic ranges, the choices of the translator may push the meaning in a particular direction and reveal a particular viewpoint.<sup>3</sup> The choice of ἑσχατος to represent ܡܬܢܐ in ch 2 has that sort of effect. Moreover, Jeansonne's approach does not allow for the fact that the translator's intention does not always coincide with literary result. Even when he intended to translate the Semitic as literally as possible, the result does not always reflect literary craft in the source language. For example, by translating a *Leitwort* in his *Vorlage* with several synonyms, the translator conveys surface meaning without capturing the literary effect intended by the Aramaic repetition.

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeansonne, 132f

<sup>2</sup>See the comment by David, 280, on Jeansonne's approach to 9.24-27 that her policy of avoiding literary criticism prevents her from detecting literary divergences.

<sup>3</sup>For Bruce, 'Prophetic Interpretation', 26, 'variants...sometimes reflect new ways of understanding the prophecies in the light of changing events, changing attitudes and changing exegetical methods'.

## narrative technique

The basic difference between the narratives of the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text is to be found in the role the narrator plays within the texts. In Bar-Efrat's terms, which have functioned well for the study we have undertaken, the MT narrator is more covert where his *Ṣ* counterpart tends to be more overt. The distinction is relative in that it expresses degrees of omniscience, and is observable in several ways.

It manifests itself in the way that human motives and emotions are portrayed. Where emotions such as Belshazzar's fear tend to be attributed explicitly by an all-seeing narrator of the Septuagint, MT forces the reader to deduce them from observable physical phenomena. The motives behind the actions of a character are also often attributed by the Septuagint where the MT reader is left to deduce them for himself. For example, in *Ṣ* ch 6 the narrator consistently specifies the motives behind characters' actions. In much the same way the narrator of the Septuagint from time to time betrays his position outwith the story by anticipating events in the narrative, while the Masoretic Text narrator generally observes the temporal and spatial limitations of the participants. The confinement of the narrative to one place at a time during Darius' night of suspense in ch 6 illustrates the point.

The covert stance thus adopted by the Aramaic narrator is characteristic of biblical narrative. The biblical authors who convey such a narrator face the challenge of how to portray point of view within the story without compromising the narrator. In Daniel the implied reader is encouraged to adopt the perspective of the narrator in several ways. Sometimes point of view is conveyed by astute deployment of key words, such as the 'interpretation' vocabulary in ch 2 or the words relating to prayer in ch 6. At other times, especially in the descriptions of Daniel in ch 5, variations in dialogue are suggestive. In that connection, and typically for biblical narrative, the minor characters of the queen mother in ch 5 and Arioch in ch 2 function as servants of the narrator. The former's surprising defiance of convention as a comment on one of the main personalities is also a characteristic narrative device. Particularly in the highly visual ch 5, but to a lesser extent elsewhere, variations in what Berlin analogously calls

'camera angle' are used effectively. Perhaps the most risky perspective device is the use of irony or even parody to help the reader identify with the narrative. The comedic function is most significant in chs 3, 5 and 6.

All of these MT features result in a certain subtlety and potential ambiguity which is not as marked in the more overt narration of the Septuagint. One result, for example, of the ̣ narrator's anticipation of motives in ch 6 is a less ironic or comedic presentation. The character of the queen mother is treated more conventionally and therefore less significantly, and there are differences in the visual perspective created by the ̣ narrator of ch 5. Significant words or recurring syntactical patterns that convey point of view in MT are not always present in the Septuagint. Sometimes that is because they were not perceived, while at other times it is because of the differing natures of the two languages. For example, that 'tree' is neuter and 'king' is masculine in Greek means the Septuagint of ch 4 cannot reproduce the ambiguity arising from the fact that both nouns are masculine in Aramaic.

A good illustration of the different approach of ̣ to point of view comes in ch 4 when the management of dialogue is compared in each version. Although the MT narrator nearly lost control of his material where several windows of dialogue are open at once, ultimately it remains clear which point of view is being expressed. The contrary is the case in ̣ where the material becomes more important than the shape of the narrative. The meaning is no longer to be found at least partly in the form of the narrative. Moreover the control that Nebuchadnezzar exerts over the narrative in ch 4 is not counterbalanced by clues that his viewpoint is not the narrator's. As narrator, his description of Daniel's outward aspect in 4.19 is an exception to the generalization that the ̣ narrator is more overt. Yet that in itself remains part of the problem in ̣ ch 4, that the narrative is unable to modify the outlook of its unreliable narrator, Nebuchadnezzar.

The internal consistency and congruency with other biblical narratives of the role of the covert narrator in Daniel 2-7, and techniques related to that role, convey an impression of the Masoretic Text as a more deliberate and carefully crafted account than its ̣

counterpart. Apart from any other considerations, the fact that Theodotion reflected the literary quality of MT is likely to have played a part in its eventual displacement of the Septuagint version of Daniel.

### **narrative structure**

The repetition noted above of key words and patterns in MT is one factor which gives an overall structure to the chapters under investigation. There are times when the impact of these links is not as evident in the Septuagint. That is one aspect of the wider discussion of the way individual stories relate to Daniel 2-7 as a larger narrative unit.

In general terms, there is less divergence between the versions of chs 2 and 7 as compared to chs 3-6. As a result the thematic links between these two chapters are present in the Greek as well as the Aramaic, although the play on words may not be so evident in one or two instances. The most likely explanation of this is that the timespan between the emergence of the Semitic forms of these chapters and the Old Greek translation was comparatively shorter than was the case for the intervening chs 3-6. I consider that explanation in more detail in the context of the text historical discussion below.

There are more striking variations of structure in other places. Ch 5 is more independent of ch 4 in the Septuagint. At the same time there is a stronger linking between chs 3 and 4 in  $\mathfrak{G}$  than is the case for the Masoretic Text. Not only does the confession of Nebuchadnezzar at the end of ch 4 draw on the material in the Additions in ch 3, but both chapters are significantly dated by  $\mathfrak{G}$  in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. The Greek translation of both those chapters is also strongly redolent of the concerns of the visions of chs 7ff. These differences have implications for how the overall structure of the material may have been viewed by the Septuagint. Taking into account the additional phenomenon that there is a weaker relationship between chs 3 and 6 in the Greek, it begins to look as though the P967 structure with chs 7 and 8 immediately after ch 4 was an older ordering of the Septuagint tradition. This links the evil of Nebuchadnezzar (chs 3 and 4) with events in Daniel's first vision (ch 7).

The P967 ordering also has an effect on the nature of chs 2-7 as a narrative unit. As we have seen, the Masoretic Text shapes the narrative in such a way that the promised revelation of 'what will be after this' (2.29, **לְהוֹא אַחֲרַי דְּנָה**) is to some extent realized in ch 7. The promise and the revelation form a frame for the intervening stories. This literary feature of the Aramaic, which treats historical events in the context of wider issues, is also present in the individual stories to a greater or lesser extent. It is most marked in ch 5 where the reading of the writing is so long delayed, but there is a level of suspense in the other narratives also. The Septuagint linking, particularly in the P967 order, provides a much sharper focus on Jewish suffering at the hand of gentile powers and a more negative view of Nebuchadnezzar, but is at the cost of a more subtle and multi-faceted analysis of the interaction between the earthly and the heavenly available in the Masoretic Text.

#### **literary merit in the Septuagint**

The comments above do not mean that our translator was artless. He was limited by a less polished *Vorlage* than MT and handicapped by his perception of the contemporary applicability of the Aramaic, yet there is a certain facility of expression about the way he translated what he saw. This may be seen in his willingness to use synonymous words and phrases, but is also evident in the occasional word or phrase or structure. The nicely balanced statement, 'the vision is accurate and this interpretation trustworthy' (2.45), has later echoes in chs 4 and 6. The irony of the plotters calling Daniel the king's 'friend' in ch 6 or the picture in ch 4 of a usurper making merry in the palace are further examples of a lively touch.

#### **the symbolic**

The way that narrative form and structure differ between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint relates to the way the two versions treat the symbolic. In the context of the discussion of the respective interpretations of the great tree in ch 4, I noted the lack of agreed terminology for working with these sorts of categories. There we saw, in the terms adopted for the purpose of the discussion, how the Masoretic



Text was more symbolic and the Septuagint more allegorical in its understanding of the cosmic tree. The MT understood the tree in a way that was at the same time local and universal. While the tree was a picture of Nebuchadnezzar's pride and fall, the symbol also hinted at a much wider concern moving outward from the local application. The Septuagint concentrated more on a one to one correspondence between features of the symbol and aspects of the king's life, thus reducing the picture's significance to its immediate application. One effect of that is that the spheres of vision and interpretation remain distinct from one another.

That the Septuagint pictures a more straightforward relationship between the earthly and heavenly realms in ch 7 is another expression of the same tendency. In the Septuagint the holy ones and the son of man are distinct entities, and the close correspondence between vision and interpretation is again more in evidence. The Masoretic Text contains an interplay between the divine and the human which defies neat categorizations. Somehow the divine is also human, and the human divine. Apart from anything else, the academic debate over both the son of man and the holy ones demonstrates that ambiguity.

The MT characteristic, within and across narratives, of setting human history in the context of an overarching concern, and indeed of working out that concern through the portrayal of temporal events, reinforces that impression. Concerns of heavenly significance are worked out in political terms, but not in the sense that earthly realities merely reflect a heavenly battle. Because the two planes interact, the Masoretic Text does not separate meaning and interpretation when dealing with divine revelation. The dream of ch 2 needed the intervention of the Most High to be described as well as interpreted. The acts of reading and of solving the writing on the wall were functions of the same divine gift. There is no distinction between the earthly manifestation and the divine messenger behind it. The Septuagint coincides with MT ch 2 in that respect, more for the reasons of text history noted earlier. However, in ch 5 ⑤ assumes that only the interpretation of the writing is a problem.

The narrative differences both express and help to bring about the

different understanding of the symbolic. An ambiguous covert narrative style in MT blurs distinctions, whereas the more overt omniscience of the Septuagint seeks to clarify them. The symbols of the Masoretic Text turn out to be highly appropriate in a story struggling to work out the tension of being a faithful Jew in a foreign land. The symbols of the Septuagint and their treatment therein, on the other hand, reflect a situation where a threatened Jewish nation must struggle to maintain its distinctiveness.

### wisdom

The two versions hold differing views of Daniel as a wisdom figure, and the fact that they do so is related to matters discussed immediately above. Just as there is an interplay between the symbol and its interpretation, between the human and the divine, so there is a tension over the role of Daniel the wise man in the Masoretic Text. The same tension is not present in the Septuagint. Apart from chs 3 and 6, there is no court contest in *Ḥ*, because to acknowledge the contest is to validate Daniel as 'chief' of the Babylonian wise men (MT 4.6). The contest implies an admission that Daniel is a member of the same set as the pagan court officials. MT is prepared to engage that ambiguity, but the Septuagint does not wish to make such an identification. The struggles of chs 6 and 3 centre respectively on Daniel's political wisdom and the public refusal of the three young men to engage in idolatry. Because they do not concern the mantic powers of the Jews' opponents, there is not a problem for the Septuagint.

This implies that there are differing views of wisdom at work in the versions. The difference is by no means absolute or consistently portrayed, but tendencies can be detected. There is a persistent thread in the Septuagint narratives that sees Daniel as an established wise elder in the Jewish community. His calling of the fast in ch 2 is one place where he is so pictured. This wise man develops out of the Solomonic figure who rises to prominence in Susanna, and relates wisdom inwards to the Jewish community. The wisdom exercised in the Masoretic Text of 2-6 is directed outwards towards the Babylonian / Persian context in which the exiles find themselves. Both versions combine in the person of Daniel the roles of purveyor of divine revelation and exerciser of

political wisdom, but MT does not shy away from the mantic aspects or identification with heathen mantic practitioners.

The issue is a little different from ch 7 onwards. Because there is no comparison in question, Daniel is recognized by the Septuagint as a visionary. It identifies its wise judge of 1-6 with the visionary of ch 7 in that the nationalist concerns link both major sections. The connection in MT is more of a literary one as the visions of Daniel are the culmination of his mantic role in the early chapters, at the same time as being a reversal of roles from interpreter to dreamer. An exception to the Septuagint's less mantic perceptions in 2-6 occurs at 4.19 where *Θ* hints that Daniel's experience was to some extent ecstatic, although this can be explained as an anticipation of ch 7 by the translator.

It is difficult to explain the origins of each understanding of wisdom, as there is little agreement amongst critics about the nature of wisdom or its purveyors in the book of Daniel. Müller argues with some success that an archaic manticism from the Israelite tradition, such as that evident in the dreamer Joseph reappeared in the second century BCE.<sup>4</sup> For him that is a crucial element in the development of apocalyptic. In that case the Septuagint represents an earlier pre-apocalyptic tradition.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, Whybray considers that there was no class of Israelite sages as such to counter the Babylonian wise men. Only much later does a class develop, which he identifies with the maskilim of the Hebrew sections of Daniel.<sup>6</sup> By that reasoning, the Septuagint is more

---

<sup>4</sup>Müller, 'Mantische Weisheit', 271ff, although that begs the question of the date of the Joseph stories. Von Rad, 281, also sees the wisdom of Daniel as 'basically old', although his views on the origins of apocalyptic differ from those of Müller. Gammie, 'Dualism', 377, also views Daniel's wisdom as 'old sapiential ethical dualism'. Barker, *The Older Testament*, 92, argues that such 'esoteric' wisdom in fact points to a lost tradition rooted in what she sees as the older strata of the Old Testament. Its presence in a nationalistic setting in Daniel is important to her argument for its existence.

<sup>5</sup>As von Rad, 281, considered MT also to be.

<sup>6</sup>Whybray, 16. Similarly Saldarini, 254, says the wisdom of Daniel is a Palestinian usage rather than of the diaspora. Hammer, 26, locates the 'transcendental character of wisdom' in ch 2 with 'much of the later

likely to be a later corrective away from the pluralist tendencies of the Masoretic Text.

There is no more agreement on the relationship of Daniel to other wisdom circles. He may or may not belong to the same scribal tradition as that of Ben Sira 38.24-39.11.<sup>7</sup> Saldarini puts the wisdom of MT Daniel later rather than earlier when he equates it to that of Ben Sira. Collins credits responsibility for the book of Daniel to an identifiable circle known in Daniel as maskilim.<sup>8</sup> As we have seen, others disagree on the existence or otherwise of such a circle. They are not recognized by the Septuagint version. Some have suggested that Daniel has hasidic origins, or is even linked to early Essenism.<sup>9</sup> This may have been in reaction to the more nationalist approach of the Hasmoneans as expressed in the books of the Maccabees.<sup>10</sup> It is even possible that such a conflict is discernible in Daniel itself if 11.34 is a slighting reference to those who give 'a little help' (עזר מעט), as compared to the ones 'who stumble' (הכשיל).<sup>11</sup> There is little consensus on the significance of these matters for the dating of Daniel texts. To complicate the picture further, de Vries suggests the Masoretic Text manifests a late Essenism with a Zadokite emphasis, whereas David says the Septuagint represents a form of Zadokite messianism in contrast to the Masoretic Text.<sup>12</sup>

---

wisdom literature'.

<sup>7</sup>Saldarini, 254, says Daniel is part of that scribal tradition, but Wilson, 373, is intent on dispelling that notion.

<sup>8</sup>Collins, 'Daniel and his Social World', 132f

<sup>9</sup>Blenkinsopp, 18, Hartman and DiLella, 43ff, and Davies, 'Hasidim', 130. The present discussion begs the important point raised by Davies as to whether or not there ever was an identifiable group called hasidim.

<sup>10</sup>Blenkinsopp, 18, and de Vries, 274n

<sup>11</sup>Tcherikover, 198 and 477n, thinks the hasidim stumble and the Hasmoneans give a little help. Davies, 'Hasidim', 129, agrees with the general idea but not with the precise identification of groups made by Tcherikover.

<sup>12</sup>de Vries, 274n. In the words of David, 297, the Septuagint points to 'a precise form of messianism revolving around the restoration of the legitimate high priest or at least of a legitimate successor of the Zadokite priesthood'.

In light of the conflicting evidence, it is difficult to set the differing MT and ̔ pictures of Daniel as a wisdom figure in a wider context. The aphoristic view of Daniel in ̔ is unlikely to reflect a translation of the later concept of maskilim back into chs 2-6, as we have seen that the Septuagint does not seem to view them as a class. But the problem with seeing them as predecessors of the mantic apocalypticists is that the picture of Daniel as a mantic official is part and parcel of the Persian backdrop to the stories. A possible solution is that there were various Hebrew circles of wisdom in tension with each other from at least the Persian period.<sup>13</sup> Whatever labels we may attach to them, this tension is probably hinted at in the Masoretic Text. Perhaps it also explains the differences in outlook between the versions if each one is built out of earlier divergent circles. For the moment it is sufficient to note the dual character of the Septuagint, sometimes suggesting an earlier and sometimes a later tradition than MT. I return to this discussion later in these concluding remarks.

It is possible that Theodotion's replacement of the Septuagint is partly a reflection of this conflict of wisdom circles. That would explain the existence of a Theodotion or an ur-Theodotion in pre-Christian times. It also helps to explain the prevalence of Theodotion in the post 2nd temple rabbinic period, because then the values of the hasidim prevailed over those of the Hasmoneans. And Theodotion by then would be more acceptable as nearer to the Masoretic Text, which was increasingly taking on authoritative status.

### **theological or political concerns**

It becomes evident as the early chapters of Daniel are studied that the political and theological concerns of the versions cannot be separated. Certain temporal events form a backdrop either to the production of the stories or their translation. The attitude of each version towards these events is tied up with its theological concerns.

---

<sup>13</sup>See Hayman, 106f, who identifies three 'trajectories' of wisdom which develop in different directions. He considers that at least one of his trajectories, the reshaped ancient myth of secret heavenly wisdom, is discernible well before Qohelet.

The absence from parts of the Septuagint of the court contest is not only an indication of the  $\Theta$  view of wisdom. It also hints at the immediate political concerns of the two versions in the central chs 4 and 5. The occurrence of the court contests in both chapters of the Masoretic Text helps to knit together the two accounts around the person of Nebuchadnezzar. Not only does Belshazzar stand in judgement before the hand of God, he also suffers invidious comparison with his illustrious predecessor. Because the stories do not function as a pair in  $\Theta$ , from which the recapitulation on Nebuchadnezzar's career in ch 5 is absent, the comparison is not as evident. Just as Belshazzar is not as bad as his MT counterpart, so in human terms Nebuchadnezzar is not viewed as positively by the Septuagint. Indeed, he becomes in  $\Theta$  an embodiment *par excellence* of the evil king pictured in ch 7. However, because the Septuagint views Nebuchadnezzar in more nationalistic terms than does MT, his acknowledgments of the Most High are explicit confessions of the God of Israel rather than the universalist statements of the Masoretic Text. The same interest in the conversion of the king is also evident in the Septuagint's treatment of Darius, although there it is even more strongly stated and seems to hint at a particular tradition which thought highly of Darius. MT remains indifferent towards him. But, particularly in the case of Darius, these distinctions should not be too boldly drawn in light of the interaction noted between the different blocks of royal confession material.

The Septuagint version's desire to see the kings converted to the God of Israel is part of the wider phenomenon of its interest in the national and cultic life of the Jewish people. The Masoretic Text of the stories tends to address the issues in terms more appropriate to a diaspora setting. The  $\Theta$  treatment of the sovereigns also reflects the alertness of the Greek version to any hint of a polytheistic outlook. Hence the suspicion of a king who may conceivably be arrogating divine authority to himself. This monotheistic emphasis also shows up in  $\Theta$ 's opposition to idolatry and its adoption of the wider Old Greek convention of using  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  as a name for God.



### text historical questions

This thesis has proceeded on two assumptions about the composition history of Daniel 2-7. The first is that chs 4-6, and possibly also 3-6, were linked in MT before 2 and 7 were redacted as the outer pairing in the chiasm. It was also suggested that in its present form ch 2 is later than 3-6 and perhaps not very much earlier than ch 7. There is an earlier form of ch 2 discernible that has more in common with 3-6, before the pairing was made with ch 7. It is not accidental that the greater difference between MT and the Septuagintal *Vorlage* comes in what have been postulated as the earlier chapters: 4-6 certainly, but also ch 3 where the long Additions occur. This theory of the composition of Daniel 2-7 has proved to be a workable one.

The second premise is less one of chronology and more one of literary structure, and is that presented by Lenglet: that the Aramaic chapters of the Masoretic Text are arranged in a chiasm with chs 4 and 5 as the central pair. This too has turned out to be a workable proposition within the limitations that Lenglet himself warns about. The Nebuchadnezzar material alone ensures that at one level chs 4 and 5 function as a continuous narrative. Ch 6 relates to them thematically to a limited extent, but has the strongest relationship with ch 3. While there is some continuity through all the stories, it is notable that ch 7 has the most in common with chs 2 and 4.

In discussing the type of wisdom evident in the respective versions, I noted the difficulty in determining whether the Septuagint takes us to a later or earlier portrayal of Israelite wisdom. A narrative critical comparison reveals the same tantalizing duality in the Septuagint when it comes to considering the composition history of both MT and G. The Old Greek seems to take us both closer to an *Ursprung* and further away from the putative Persian provenance of the Aramaic.

The Septuagint reflects an earlier form of the story in chs 4 and 6 particularly. The Greek dream of the great tree bears some comparison with the early story of Nabonidus' conflict and exile and possible madness. The procedures surrounding Daniel's night in the lion pit in the same version also seem to preserve an early type of trial by ordeal,

the details of which are not relevant to the concerns of the Masoretic Text. Against that, the administrative and courtly vocabulary of the Masoretic Text tend to convey a Persian provenance which is largely lost in translation, indicating a much later translator. The looseness of the narrative connections between the stories suggests the translator encountered them before they were redacted into the MT form, yet the Septuagint treats the stories of Daniel 2-6 in a manner contemporaneous with the subsequent visions of chs 7-12. Hence the habit of reading later understandings in the MT material into a translation of earlier sections.

Aspects of the Masoretic Text reveal similar problems. A Babylonian / Persian backdrop to chs 2-6 is evident, yet such is not the case for the later chapters. At the same time it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Aramaic / Hebrew Book of Daniel is intended as a unity. The literary links across a number of form divisions ensure that this is so. The implication is that, although the concerns of 2-6 are early, their incorporation into a unit with 7-12 and redaction into the present shape are almost certainly late. It is surprising that the integrity of the early stories is so well preserved despite the later developments. Moreover, why has the interest in the gentile Nebuchadnezzar been retained in MT alongside the extremely negative view of world rulers contained in the visions?

Two further problems are raised by the nature of the versions. The first is that the version that is most obviously Maccabean, and hence Palestinian in outlook, is the Greek translation. It would have been expected that interest in translating such exilic stories into Greek would have arisen in the diaspora rather than in Palestine itself. Another question is raised by the 5 ordering witnessed to in P967. That order, allied with what seem to be intentional variations in dating, suggest that the Septuagint reflects a deliberate arrangement of the stories that is different from the Masoretic Text. Did that occur before or after the redaction of MT?<sup>14</sup> It is likely to have been earlier or at

---

<sup>14</sup>In the opinion of David, 94, an Aramaic collection was 'even translated into Greek, before it was expanded into a bilingual composition during the Maccabean period'. He follows Lust, 'Daniel 4-5', 5f, against

least at the same time, given the insertion of chs 7 and 8 into the stories, which suggests that translation may have taken place very close to when MT reached its present form.

Historical critical approaches have produced little agreement on these complexities. The composition history evidence produced by a literary critical approach is hardly decisive in one direction, but some probabilities can be adduced. The evidence suggests that the earliest collation in the tradition represented by MT was chs 4-6, and possibly including ch 3 as well. Chs 2 and 7 are a later pair which complete the chiasm, although the core of ch 2 is a somewhat earlier composition. That it received additional material at the same time as the attachment of ch 7 to the narratives is likely. The feeling for Nebuchadnezzar and a positive view of Daniel's courtly role influenced this tradition from early in the process of its formation. At the same time there must have been a differing Aramaic tradition which grew out of the same pool of stories, perhaps also originating in the Persian exile, which is reflected in the uncollected stories represented by *Ṣ* Daniel. This tradition developed a more hostile view of Nebuchadnezzar and a less mantic conception of the wisdom of Daniel. The situation could be analogous to the treatment of Nebuchadnezzar in Jeremiah 27-29, to which we have alluded on several occasions. There too the Septuagint has apparently preserved an early and less friendly tradition about the Babylonian king.

The stories of Daniel were finally collected during the first half of the second century BCE in Palestine, and combined with the visions as a direct result of the religious and national crisis centred on Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Whatever circle was responsible for the MT compilation, it was probably not one sympathetic to the Hasmonean or Maccabean approach. The stories were very soon translated into Greek in the light of the vision material. The Aramaic so translated came from the differing tradition earlier mentioned, perhaps also Persian in origin but representing finally a Palestinian outlook. Whether the translation was physically undertaken in Judea or the diaspora, it also reflects a Judean

---

Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 200f.

outlook. It is at this stage that the translator's unfamiliarity with aspects of the original setting of the stories and his interest in the Maccabean struggle reveals itself. This in part explains the constant interplay between translational interpretation and variant *Vorlage* as reasons for differences.<sup>15</sup> At the same time the variant ordering available in P967 was probably adopted, and the substantial Greek Additions inserted. Whether or not the Additions had a Semitic original has not been resolved. There is no physical manuscript evidence available to suggest it. The argument of those who claim such an original is dependent on the Semitic cast of the language, but does not adequately take account of the interaction between the two languages during the first and second centuries BCE.<sup>16</sup> That a Greek work can successfully be retroverted into Aramaic or Hebrew may prove nothing more than that it has been authored by a Greek speaker immersed in a Semitic mind-set and under the influence of Septuagintal Greek.<sup>17</sup>

This analysis is put forward tentatively as the most likely explanation of sparse and conflicting evidence, and no doubt raises as many questions as it solves. There are two which seem to me particularly acute. First, it is surprising that a Palestinian tradition should have been translated into Greek at all. The more usual assumption is an Alexandrian origin for the translation, which could perhaps be supported by the unusual interest of ̣ ch 11 in Egypt.<sup>18</sup> Against this must be set the driving interest of the Septuagint in the temple and cult, as well as in national life, which suggests a Palestinian setting. If ̣ is a

---

<sup>15</sup>See Aejmelaeus, 'Septuagintal Translation Techniques', 398, who points out that 'it is possible to have both free translation and a different *Vorlage* in the same text'.

<sup>16</sup>Moore, 44ff, summarizes the arguments for both points of view. While he favours a Hebrew original for the Additions, he concedes that 'not only are there very few Hebraisms that one can point to in the additions, but there is not one indisputably clear example of a Greek word or phrase which can only be explained by positing a Semitic *Vorlage*'.

<sup>17</sup>See Tov, 'Three Dimensions', 533f, on the effect of translations out of Hebrew and Aramaic on the Greek language.

<sup>18</sup>But Bogaert, 'Relecture et Refonte', 200, considers that the translator's pro-Egyptian stance does not require that he be in either Egypt or Judah.

Palestinian production it would join a corpus of Greek works from that part of the world that includes the books of the Maccabees. Another possibility is that the translation did not take place on Jewish soil, but still reflects a Judean *Vorlage*. A parallel case is that of Ben Sira, a Jerusalemite work translated into Greek in Egypt. A Palestinian origin for the Septuagint is admittedly a weak point in the argument, and is possibly as circular as it is inconclusive.

A second concern relates to the Masoretic Text. The different P967 ordering indicates that the final redaction of MT took place well after the Persian period. In that case, the demonizing of Nebuchadnezzar in popular mythology may be expected to have begun. Why is the less hostile view retained by the Masoretic Text even when the visions become attached? A literary critical answer might be that this is a further reflection of the literary sophistication of the Masoretic Text's exploration of the themes. No certain historical answer is suggested by the available evidence. It is possible, however, that this is another manifestation of the existence of different political points of view centred on the wisdom trajectories noted earlier. The Masoretic Text's different treatment of the kings thereby reflects the Persian material preserved in its own particular wisdom tradition. The different attitude to the kings in the Septuagint does not therefore mean that it is later, but that it reflects a group with different agenda, a group that has probably co-existed with the Masoretic Text viewpoint for some time.<sup>19</sup> The existence of two points of view that had long been in tension with one another also explains material in both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint that is exceptional to the general trend of the version. Such material would have been the result of some interaction over time between the traditions.

### prospects

Because the texts have been treated within limited parameters, there are a number of questions inevitably left unanswered. Most obviously,

---

<sup>19</sup>David, 95, also postulates two independent collections in the early Hellenistic period.

this is only the first of a two part study in that it has only treated 6 out of the 12 chapters in Daniel. The brief survey chapter on the Hebrew sections, as well as confirming a continuity across the linguistic division in both versions, served to highlight the issues that would repay treatment in the light of the work done on chs 2-7. Several further areas of study also beckon at the end of this narrative critical comparison. The first relates to the history of the texts while the others are more theological.

I have paid little attention to the linguistic evidence for dating the Aramaic of the Masoretic Text. There is time only to note that a number of studies have recently cast doubt on Driver's famous assertion that 'the Greek words demand, the Hebrew supports, and the Aramaic permits, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332)'.<sup>20</sup> Kitchen took issue with Driver in 1965 when he demonstrated a number of linguistic features that could indicate an earlier date for the stories.<sup>21</sup> Although Kitchen himself has not returned to that particular fray since, others have accumulated more evidence that supports his thesis. Coxon was cautious in his series of linguistic studies in the late 1970's but allowed that much of the evidence could point to an earlier date for the Aramaic of Daniel.<sup>22</sup> Other work, by such as Yamauchi and Masson cast doubt on the particular notion that the presence of Greek words in Daniel necessitates a late date.<sup>23</sup> Fitzmyer on the Genesis Apocryphon also points to an earlier date for the Aramaic of

---

<sup>20</sup>Driver, lxiii. See also Bevan, 41f.

<sup>21</sup>See his conclusions in Kitchen, 77ff. A much earlier move in the same direction was taken by Schaefer, 199ff, as cited by David, 50.

<sup>22</sup>For example Coxon, 'A Morphological Study', 416, 'Consonantal Mutations', 22, 'Distribution of Synonyms', 512, and 'Syntax', 122. More recently Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel*, 108, concludes that 'the search for features in (Daniel Aramaic) of an early date should be pursued more intensively'.

<sup>23</sup>Masson, 113ff, and Yamauchi, 47, who concludes his essay with the hope that 'future commentaries will come to recognize that the Greek words in Daniel cannot be used to date the book to the Hellenistic age'.



Daniel.<sup>24</sup> There have of course been dissenting voices.<sup>25</sup> It would be useful now to consider the linguistic evidence in tandem with the literary indicators towards a greater understanding of the textual history.<sup>26</sup> As far as the Septuagint text is concerned, I have ignored the possibility that different parts of the translation may have come from different hands. That too is an area which would repay careful study and could turn out to have text historical significance.

This thesis also asks for a more thorough reflection on the tool of narrative criticism from a theological rather than simply a methodological perspective. By seeing the meaning of the narrative as in part a function of its form, and with an awareness of the implied reader and implied narrator within the text, I have used narrative criticism as a means of exploring a particular group of texts and their relation to one another. However, I have studiously avoided the larger questions raised about the method. The relationship, if any, of 'narrative theology' to narrative criticism is a particularly important one. In that regard, Frei's analysis of 'the eclipse of biblical narrative' has motivated a number of thinkers in the field who are not necessarily in agreement with one another.<sup>27</sup> In fact, do the proponents of narrative criticism think in terms of a theology related to the method at all? Furthermore, in Frei's terms, what do they understand by realistic narrative and how do they apply the concept to biblical interpretation?

---

<sup>24</sup>Fitzmyer, 'Some Observations', 279, and *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 19ff. See also Archer, 161ff, whose polemical tone should not distract the reader from his argument for Daniel Aramaic as an early eastern form of the language.

<sup>25</sup>For example van der Woude, 306f, who links linguistic questions with a redaction critical approach to the problem of bilingualism in Daniel. In his view it is not outside the bounds of possibility that classical imperial Aramaic was used in the mid second century BCE.

<sup>26</sup>A great deal of useful work has in fact been done by David, 270ff, in a lengthy excursus on the Septuagint version, although his focus is almost exclusively on 9.24-27 and 8.11b-14.

<sup>27</sup>See Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* and 'The "Literal Reading" of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does it Stretch or Will it Break?'. The various directions his students have taken is well illustrated in the volume of essays edited by G. Green, *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation*.

Ought the opposite of 'historical critical' be 'realistic' or 'literary', or does the concept of narrative realism provide a way through the perceived dichotomy between the two?<sup>28</sup>

Frei is puzzled that the rise of the realistic novel in eighteenth and nineteenth century English literature occurred at the same time as the emergence of the historical critical method, which militated against a realistic reading of biblical narrative.<sup>29</sup> Prickett holds a mirror up to Frei and wonders if the reverse is true. Prose realism was in fact an attempt to respond to the new ways of looking at biblical narrative.<sup>30</sup> His opinion is grounded on the view that realism is not a possible concept in the biblical Hebrew world.<sup>31</sup> Whether or not Prickett can make a case, the question he raises of the applicability of late Western categories of literary criticism to biblical stories is an important one. Narrative critics of the Bible are often indebted to European critics of the novel such as Frye, Booth or Genette. Is this because the Bible has been formative in Western literature, or is there a danger of imposing external categories on the biblical narrative?<sup>32</sup>

A further question in need of development is the relationship of narrative form to meaning. Alter would say that the characteristics of biblical narrative reflect the nature of the God spoken about in the narratives, his dealings with humanity, and his position in relation to space and time.<sup>33</sup> For him, the devices that draw the reader into the stories are themselves an expression of Jewish monotheism. While the particularity of Alter's application can be self-limiting, Auerbach treats the topic in more general terms and makes an influential case that 'The concept of God held by the Jews is less a cause than a symptom of

---

<sup>28</sup>The review of Frei by Bruce, 'Review of Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*', 200, suggests that it does not.

<sup>29</sup>Frei, *The Eclipse*, 16 and 130ff

<sup>30</sup>Prickett, 7

<sup>31</sup>Prickett, 15

<sup>32</sup>Auerbach, 23, argues powerfully for the former view.

<sup>33</sup>Alter, 32, 155, 158 etc

their manner of comprehending and representing things'.<sup>34</sup> This question of the relationship of literary form to revelation is a huge one that is related to the foregoing thesis but whose treatment must wait for another time.

A final prospect raised is the equally vast topic of canon. A literary comparison of the Septuagint and Masoretic Text of Daniel 2-7 has raised historical questions which relate to the debate over the formation of the Jewish canon. The different positions are epitomized in the conversation between Beckwith and Barton.<sup>35</sup> The latter argues that outside the Pentateuch the prophets and writings remained a very unsettled collection until very late. This unsettlement in itself, particularly in the prophets, suggests the presence of a protest element opposing the religious establishment.<sup>36</sup> Beckwith, on the other hand, holds the view that the Hebrew canon was fixed into its tripartite structure at an early stage.<sup>37</sup> It would be interesting to consider if the presence of differing wisdom circles centred on Daniel from as early as Persian times could have any input into this debate.

---

<sup>34</sup>Auerbach, 8

<sup>35</sup>Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* and Barton, *Oracles of God*.

<sup>36</sup>Barton, *Oracles*, 267ff

<sup>37</sup>Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon*, 68ff and 123ff. He argues that Daniel, along with Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, was a settled part of the Hagiographa from the second century BCE.

## APPENDIX ONE

### THEODOTION

What follows is a brief chapter by chapter summary of the most prominent differences between Theodotion and the Masoretic Text in Daniel 2-7. The relationship of those differences to the Septuagint will also be noted where appropriate. As a rule, the  $\theta$  translator follows the sense of the Aramaic closely but not slavishly. Differences sometimes reflect problems in translation or the need to depart from strict equivalence in the interests of sense. At times,  $\theta$  seems to reflect a *Vorlage* different from MT. Occasionally, there is a hint of interpretation about the version, either for theological reasons or because the translator apparently feels the need to clarify a word or phrase. The distinction between these two types of variation is not always easy to draw.

#### Daniel 2

Daniel 2 contains several examples of variations which arise because the Aramaic is difficult. This is likely to be the case with 'his sleep went from him' (v 1,  $\acute{o} \upsilon\pi\nu\omicron\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \acute{\alpha}\pi' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ) as a rendering of the impersonal Hebrew expression **שנתו נהיתה עליו**.  $\theta$  has also interpreted **וְ** at the start of v 9 as  $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$  in the interest of clarifying some tortuous Aramaic syntax. Verse 30 is similarly difficult with its hint of anacolouthon in the Aramaic, and Theodotion, like the Septuagint, gets over the hurdle with a rephrasing of the sense. The use of  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\eta$  in v 25 to translate the difficult **בהתבהלה** is a rendering that we also meet in  $\theta$  3.24/91 and 6.20, and is an example of the Greek taking on a wider

range of meaning to match the semantic range of the Semitic original.<sup>1</sup>

Other differences arise when  $\theta$  adopts a particular modification which is consistently observed by the translator. Such is the case with the insertion of a possessive pronoun to modify 'interpretation' in vv 7, 9 and 16. The translator may have adopted an alternative reading of the consonantal text in vv 7 and 16, but that cannot be the case for פשרא in v 9. Similarly,  $\theta$  rejects the MT modifiers of 'earthenware' (חסף) in vv 41 and 43 (די-פחד and טינא) and instead employs ὀστράκινο and ὀστρακον throughout. Another example of the same phenomenon is the habit seen elsewhere in  $\theta$  of rearranging lists when they are perceived to be out of order. Theodotion's objection on this occasion is to a perceived misplacing of 'earthenware' (חסף or חשף) in the lists of vv 35 and 45.<sup>2</sup> At times this sort of difference may be accounted for as a dependence on  $\mathfrak{U}$  by  $\theta$ , but the evidence for that is mixed.<sup>3</sup>

In the examples cited above,  $\theta$  sometimes agrees with  $\mathfrak{U}$  against MT (vv 7, 9, 41, 43 and 45) but sometimes an expression is suggestive of an independent interpretation (vv 16, 35 and 41). A particular example that is probably both an interpretation by  $\theta$  and a sign of  $\mathfrak{U}$  influence is the phrase 'what must happen' (vv 28, 29 and 45, ἃ / τί δεῖ γενέσθαι) after these things or at the end. Theodotion appears to have been influenced by the  $\mathfrak{U}$  rendering of למה on the first two occurrences, and then reproduced that reading in v 45 where the Septuagint is content with a simple ἐσόμενα. Whether or not there is a sense of compulsion lying behind δεῖ as used by  $\mathfrak{U}$  has been discussed. As far as  $\theta$  is concerned, repetition of the phrase may well tie in with the translator's view of what the dream of Nebuchadnezzar means.

---

<sup>1</sup>See the extensive discussion by Walters, 144ff, on this particular example.

<sup>2</sup>See Rosenthal, 16, on the vacillation in Biblical Aramaic between  $\mathfrak{W}$  and  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

<sup>3</sup>See the discussion by Schmitt, 9ff, of the relationship between  $\theta$  and  $\mathfrak{U}$ , and what he calls the 'Inkonstanz und Inhomogenität' of Theodotion. Note that he makes a distinction that is beyond the scope of this discussion between the putative Theodotion of Daniel (" $\theta'$ ") and the real Theodotion ( $\theta$ ). See also Montgomery, *Daniel*, 170.

On other occasions it is not possible to determine whether a difference has come about because the translator interprets or because his Aramaic *Vorlage* differs from MT. A shortened form of v 40 either clarifies a verbose Aramaic or witnesses to a time before the corrupt form available in MT. The  $\theta$  expression 'it will be shattered by itself' (v 42, ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἔσται συντριβόμενον) is a vivid exposition of the fragility of the kingdom expressed in MT and  $\Theta$ , but a departure of this magnitude is out of character for  $\theta$ , and so a different *Vorlage* is the more likely explanation. That is also the most likely explanation for Theodotion's reading 'insight' (v 20, ἡ σύνεσις) for 'might' (גבורה). The grammatical difficulties represented by the isolated infinitive 'to report' (v 27, ἀναγγεῖλαι) arise because the Aramaic element כלין is absent from Theodotion. This also suggests the possibility of a different, possibly corrupt, *Vorlage* of v 27, as does the shorter form of v 31 in Theodotion. Perhaps the substitution of a singular first person pronoun for the plural in v 23 (ἐγνώρισάς μοι instead of הודעתני) reflects a different *Vorlage*, but it could be an amendment intended by  $\theta$  to overcome a difficulty with the sense of the narrative.

### Daniel 3

A feature of Daniel 3 is that Theodotion includes the Additions, and in other respects also has a little more in common with the Septuagint than is the case elsewhere in Daniel 2-7. There are hints that Theodotion is not quite as literal as usual in ch 3, particularly in terms of the addition or subtraction of elements and the accuracy of semantic information conveyed by the translation.<sup>4</sup> This may be illustrated by the lists in vv 2f. In each instance the list of officials deviates slightly from MT, but in different ways in each case. Not only are there two fewer officials mentioned, but they are not equivalent to the officials in MT. Moreover the use of καὶ in the lists is not consistent between the two blocks of  $\theta$  material and is not equivalent to the use of ו by MT. It is generally agreed that the ו in front of 'governors' (ופתוח) in both verses is deliberately placed to divide the list into separate categories of officials. No such effect is

---

<sup>4</sup>See Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 294. These are two of the six modes he distinguishes in assessing the literalness of a translation.



discernible in  $\theta$ . This contrasts with the lists of Babylonian wisdom officials in chs 2, 4 and 5, where Theodotion reproduces the series almost exactly (2.2, 5.7, 5.11). The exceptional case is 4.4/7 where the third and fourth elements in the list are reversed, but in the light of other examples this is almost certainly due to an error in translation or transmission. It contrasts also with the care by which Theodotion attempts to reproduce the MT administrative terminology in ch 6 (v 8, for example). In a similar vein the use of καὶ in the lists of musical instruments (vv 5, 7 and 10) does not match MT.

Of a slightly different order is the inclusion of 'bagpipes' (v 7, συμφωνίας) in the first repeat of the musical instrument list. This is either a witness to an earlier *Vorlage* before that item had dropped out of the Aramaic text, or an attempt by the  $\theta$  translator to correct a perceived corruption in MT. The same phenomenon is observed in 5.23 where MT varies a list by reversing the items, gold and silver, while Theodotion preserves the order that obtained in 5.2.

The above differences could be due to a different translation practice on the part of  $\theta$  from that obtaining in other chapters.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, they could simply witness to a *Vorlage* more at variance with MT. Other divergences do point towards a slightly less literal type of translation. 'King Nebuchadnezzar' is omitted in  $\theta$  v 2. 'In that moment' (MT v 8, בְּהַיָּמָיו) is simply 'then' (τότε) in Theodotion. The closely literal nature of  $\theta$ 's translation is most likely to waver where the translator betrays his theological mind-set. Such is the case in ch 3 where Theodotion describes the fourth figure in the furnace as 'like a son of God' (v 25/92, ὁμοία υἱῷ θεοῦ). MT has the phrase, 'like a son of the gods' (לְבֶן-אֱלֹהִים).

A number of smaller semantic variations point to translation difficulties. In vv 2 and 3 the genitive plural 'regions' (τῶν χωρῶν) is used to render מְדִינָה, which is normally regarded as a singular. The

---

<sup>5</sup>To speak of translation 'practice' rather than 'policy' or 'technique' avoids the question of how much intentionality may be assigned to the  $\theta$  translator. See Aejmelaeus, 'Translation Technique', 26ff, on the subject. The idea is expressed by Schmitt, 7, with the German word *Übersetzungsgewohnheit*.

Septuagint uses a singular accusative form, *χώραν*. In this instance the irregular non-spirantization of feminine singular determined state nouns has probably resulted in a misreading of the Aramaic consonants.<sup>6</sup> The Aramaic idiom *שִׁים...טַעַם*, 'to have regard for somebody', provides *θ* with the same problems in v 12 as in 6.14. In the latter instance it is translated 'has not subjected himself to your decree' (*οὐχ ὑπετάγη τῷ δόγματί σου*). In the present chapter, *θ* renders it 'did not obey your decree' (v 12, *οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν...τῷ δόγματί σου*). Both are attempts to deal literally with *טַעַם*. The verbs *ῥύομαι* (v 17) and *ὑπερίσχω* (v 22) overlap the semantic range of the Aramaic that they are attempting to translate (*שָׁחַב* and *הִצִּיף* respectively) even though the chosen translation tends to take the meaning in a different direction. In v 27/94 a variation in meaning comes about when the syntax of the Aramaic is not reproduced quite accurately by Theodotion. The word order of MT suggests that the verbs 'gathered round' (*מִתְכַּנְּשִׁין*) and 'saw' (*חִזְיוֹן*) have separate subjects in the form of separate groups of officials. The higher ranked trio from vv 2 and 3 (*אֲחֵשְׁדֵּרפְּנִיא סַגִּינָא וּפְחוּתָא*) 'gathered round' while the officials 'saw'. This distinction is not preserved by *θ* which treats the verbs as a pair with a common subject.

Other differences between *θ* and MT are probably related to textual problems. The opening phrase in v 9 MT, 'They answered and said:' (*עֲנוּ וְאָמְדִין*), is not represented at all in Theodotion. The result is an unusual and compressed structure in which the verb *διαβάλλω* (v 8) takes both a direct and an indirect object. Such a construction is possible but unlikely. This is closely followed by the absence again in *θ* of the final phrase in MT v 10, 'will fall and worship the golden image' (*יִפֹּל וְיִסְגֵּד לְצֶלֶם דְּהַבָּא*). Again the grammatical result is not impossible, but it leaves a gap in the formula that was earlier reproduced exactly in vv 5f. Some corruption in the text of the *Vorlage* or in transmission is the most likely explanation of these differences.

Theodotion's treatment of some of the more vivid Aramaic images in this chapter cannot be adduced as evidence of a less literal translation practice, as they receive the same treatment elsewhere in the *θ*

---

<sup>6</sup>Rosenthal, 13

translation of Daniel. At v 8, the Chaldeans in Theodotion merely 'slandered' (διέβαλον) the Jews, while those in MT 'ate pieces of' (אכלו קהציות) them. This is consistent with 6.25.<sup>7</sup> In the king's final decree the general populace is enjoined to worship God lest they be 'destroyed' (v 29/96, ἀπώλειαν), according to Theodotion. According to MT they 'will be made into limbs' (תעבדו יתעבדו). The Septuagint Greek is the same as θ in v 8, but in the second image θ evokes the same picture as MT with the expression 'he will be dismembered' (v 29/96, διαμελισθήσεται). Again the Theodotionic translation is the same as in 2.5.

More difficult to explain is a puzzling Theodotion plus, the final phrase where Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego are deputed to rule over all the Jews who were in Babylon (v 30/97). The final statement in θ about the heroes' promotion is also fuller than MT but it gives no indication that their duties were with special reference to the Jews. Although the translation of Theodotion in this chapter is a little less literal than elsewhere, it is still exceedingly cautious. Such a marked divergence as this one from the Masoretic Text is often explicable in terms of the Septuagint, but such is not the case here. Whether or not it witnesses to a different *Vorlage*, it is part of the tradition of leadership within the distinct Jewish community in exile that lurks in the Greek versions. I explored this point in some detail in connection with the θ plus of 2.18.<sup>8</sup> Another instance of non-MT tradition is the date, 'in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar the king' (v 1, ἔτους ὀκτώκαιδεκάτου Ναβουχοδονοσορ). But here Theodotion reflects the Septuagint.

There are also differences between the two Greek versions in the Additions, although they are almost identical in the poetic material.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>If Goldingay, *Daniel*, 66, is right that this is an Akkadian expression, it was probably unfamiliar to the much later Greek translator.

<sup>8</sup>Plöger, 61, is uncertain whether the treatment of the three in θ is a 'restitutio in integrum', or a further promotion. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 61, thinks θ is an addition, perhaps in light of 1 Mac 2.51-61. The suggestion of Koch, 'Der Herkunft der Proto-Theodotion', 165, that this denotes the Exilarch of Parthian and Sassanid times is probably anachronistic.

<sup>9</sup>Bruce, 'Oldest Greek Version', 36, and Daubney, 46, view this in itself

At the point where the Greek diverges from the Aramaic (v 24),  $\theta$  agrees with  $\mathfrak{G}$  in focusing on the singing of the young men. However, it is more succinct in its introduction to the singing (vv 24f), but slightly longer than  $\mathfrak{G}$  in vv 46 and 51 of the prose material linking the two main sections of poetry.

There are occasional differences in verse order in the songs themselves. In poetic terms, these differences do not form a consistent pattern. At times they suggest a corruption of the Septuagint on the part of Theodotion. This seems to be the case in vv 67-72, where  $\theta$  follows the order, vv 67, 68, 71, 72, 69, 70. This results in imagery of light and dark (vv 71f) interrupting images of cold and wet instead of coming after them as in  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Within these verses also the phrase 'cold and heat' (v 67,  $\psi\chi\omicron\varsigma$  καὶ καῦμα) in Theodotion differs from 'frost and cold' ( $\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  καὶ  $\psi\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ) in the Septuagint. It is not possible to tell whether this is a corruption on the part of  $\theta$  or an attempt to link the heat of v 66 with the cold of v 68. In favour of the second option, vv 71f have similarly contrasting pairs, but against this the imagery of heat and cold seems to follow a pattern of parallel pairs rather than contrasting ones. The relationship between the two versions is also problematic at vv 84f, where the Septuagint twice does not include 'of the Lord' (κυρίου). The result is a line that scans differently from anywhere else in the song. Has  $\theta$  inserted κυρίου to correct this scanning problem? If so it has for some reason chosen to leave v 83, which is just as short on syllables, alone. On the other hand, the Septuagint may have been objecting to 'Lord' twice on a line and amended accordingly. It remains a matter of speculation.

#### Daniel 4

There are several points in  $\theta$  Daniel 4 where the translator seems to be interpreting his text. These largely relate to points of theology. In a manner typical of Theodotion in general, MT 'holy gods' (vv 5 and 15, אֱלֹהִים קְדִישִׁים) is rendered in the singular with θεοῦ ἁγίου (vv 8 and

---

as grounds for a common Semitic original of the Additions. Schmitt, 29, is not so sure, but the existence or otherwise of a Semitic *Vorlage* is not germane to the present discussion.

18). In a similar vein the rather secular advice to the king in MT v 24/27 to 'abolish' (פרק) his sins in the hope of an 'extension of your prosperity' (ארכה לשלחה) is reworked by  $\theta$ . The more godly alternative offered is the advice to the king 'to redeem your sins' (τάς ἁμαρτίας σου...λύτρωσαι) in the hope that 'God will be patient...' (ἔσται μακρόθυμος...ὁ θεός). While this translation could owe something to a broadening of semantic range of the Aramaic, it also has a theological point to it and reflects language used by  $\Theta$ . This outlook reveals itself further in  $\theta$ 's choice at v 26/29 of ναός ('temple') for the more broadly understood Aramaic word הֵיכָל. Some sort of link with the Septuagint can also be discerned in the consistent use of τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ (vv 8/11 and 17/20, 'its girth / trunk') for הַזוֹתָה ('its appearance') in Aramaic. As another aspect of interpretation, the translator in v 6/9 is either working from an uncorrupted *Vorlage* or is making a deliberate attempt to clarify a confusing MT, with 'hear' (ἄκουσον) instead of 'tell' (הוֹי).

Other minor differences can be explained either by an anachronistic understanding of the Aramaic original on the part of the translator, or by a *Vorlage* that differs from MT. An example of the former is the variable translation by  $\theta$  of חַלְפִּין ('will pass over'). Twice ἀλλαγῇσονται (vv 22/25 and 29/32) and once ἀλλοιωθῶσιν (v 20/23) are employed, and both mean 'will change', a probable reflection of the Jerusalem Palestinian Aramaic meaning. An instance of the latter is the reversal of terms in the list of mantic officials at v 4/7.

### Daniel 5

Theodotion in ch 5 presents a similar picture. At times the translator apparently misreads the MT original. Where the Aramaic נִדָּח (v 19, 'spared') is represented by the Greek ἔτυπτεν ('struck down')  $\theta$  has adopted the dominant meaning, although the parallelism of the Aramaic here and in 4.32 seems to require the less usual sense.<sup>10</sup> Sometimes a different *Vorlage* is suggested by additions or omissions of one element. A particularly strong case is the  $\theta$  inclusion of 'diviners' (γαζαρηνοί) in v 15, as this term is always a transcription of the Aramaic in

---

<sup>10</sup>Rosenthal, 15

Theodotion. Another example is the inclusion of 'reporting mighty acts' (ἀναγγέλλων κρατούμενα) in v 12.

But there is a touch of interpretation about some differences. An example that has been referred to is the rendering of the difficult **בשעם חמדא** as καὶ πίνων (v 1/2). Typically, θ speaks of 'God' rather than 'gods'. In v 11 Daniel has the spirit 'of God' (θεοῦ) in contrast to the plural of MT, while in v 23 Belshazzar is accused of arrogance 'against the Lord God' (ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον θεόν), not 'the Lord of heaven' (**מלאך-שמיא**). Elsewhere the differences hint at a desire to deal with perceived redundancy in the *Vorlage*. The omission of the phrases at the end of v 11 and beginning of v 18 (**אברהם מלכא** and **אתה**), as well as the final **מן-יהוד** in v 13, are cases in point.

### Daniel 6

Occasionally in Daniel 6 Theodotion departs from its closely literal practices. An example of this is in v 21 where the Greek does not represent the Aramaic **ענה** with ἀποκρίνω as it usually does. However θ does reproduce the idiom at v 14. Also in v 13 the Greek syntax of a participle modifying a finite verb (προσελθόντες λέγουσιν) is used to convey the two verbs joined by ו in MT (**קריבו ואמרו**). Although θ sometimes employs this more idiomatic form, it normally prefers an exact equivalence of elements. In that same verse also **קדם** does not appear in θ.

Other differences are more likely to be interpretational, as when the Greek clarifies that it is 'to his God' (v 14, παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ) that Daniel is praying. At times some uncertainty in the mind of the translator is discernible. Such may be the case where the difficult verb **רגש** (v 16) is ignored, or the nocturnal 'diversion' (v 19, **דחין**) of the king is assumed to be 'food' (ἐδέσματα). Sometimes a difference occurs because the attempted literal rendering of the Aramaic does not quite reproduce the same sense in Greek. One example is the use of ἐν σπουδῇ (v 20, 'in haste') to represent the meaning of **בהתבהלה** ('in trepidation'). Another example is the attempt to render literally the Aramaic **מן-קדמי שים טעם** (v 27). The rather ambiguous **די** of v 9 is translated by Theodotion with the equally flexible ὅπως, but the result



is a slightly different nuance in the way the clauses are linked. The more causative sense of the Greek almost suggests that the immutability of the law of the Medes and the Persians owes something to this particular decree.

The above examples probably arise from a *Vorlage* witnessed to by MT. There are other differences that suggest either a different original or a conscious attempt to tidy up the MT text. The shorter Greek in both vv 5 and 6 seems like a deliberate reduction of a verbose piece of Aramaic. The addition of 'out of the mouths of' (v 21, ἐκ στόματος) replicates the full expression that is used elsewhere in MT and θ (v 23), either by oversight on the part of the translator or because פִּה was absent from Theodotion's *Vorlage*. The θ plus material in v 19, where the agency of God in the lions' pit is detailed, clearly owes something to the Septuagint. It is possible also that θ's suggestion of Daniel's primacy at the beginning of v 4 (καὶ ἦν Δανιηλ ὑπὲρ αὐτούς) owes more to θ than to MT.

### Daniel 7

Most differences between θ and MT in Daniel 7 may be explained as problems of translation. On occasions Theodotion translates all the elements of MT, but the syntactical relationships end up at variance. Such is the case in v 19, where φοβερὸν περισσῶς seems to have been misplaced by the translator, and the subsequent description of the beast is syntactically as difficult as its MT counterpart. Another example of difficulties in translation comes where θ, in common with many translators since, has trouble with 'in its sheath' (v 15, בְּגוֹא נִדְּנָה). He resorts to the equally obscure ἐν τῇ ἔξει μου. In none of these examples is any influence from θ apparent.

Even the interpretations are normally attempts to clarify the meaning, and carry no theological significance. An example of interpretation motivated by the difficulty of the MT comes in v 6 where two changes are made in the interests of clarity. In the opening sentence, MT uses אֲחֵר ('another') and leaves 'beast' understood, where Theodotion says specifically 'another beast' (ἄλλο θηρίον). Similarly the wings of a bird 'on its back' (עַל-גְּבִיחָהּ) are understood by θ to be

'above it' (ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς). In the first example Theodotion acts independently of the Septuagint, whereas Θ shows the same understanding as θ in v 6 but uses slightly different vocabulary.

There is one significant instance of interpretation in v 27 where the puzzling 'to the people of the holy ones' (לְעַם קְדִישִׁי) is rendered simply as 'to the holy ones' (ἀγίοις). The Septuagint interprets that phrase with λαῶ ἀγίῳ, but retains an equivalence of elements in so doing. It is probable therefore that the Theodotion minus is not due to a different *Vorlage* so much as an attempt to adjust this exceptional expression towards the more usual קְדִישִׁי on its own. We have noted this habit also in other chapters where variations in repeated material are adjusted to eliminate the variation. Here the change indicates that Theodotion views 'the people of the holy ones of the Most High' (עַם קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹן) as equivalent to 'the holy ones of the Most High' (vv 18, 22 and 25, קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹן) elsewhere in the chapter.

Another possible example of interpretation on the part of θ is found in vv 23f. MT says that the fourth kingdom 'will be different' (v 23, תִּשְׁנֶה) from its predecessors, and the eleventh king 'will be different' (v 24, יִשְׁנֶה) from the ten that went before. In neither place does Theodotion use exact equivalents in translation. According to him the fourth kingdom 'will outdo' (v 23, ὑπερέξει) the other three, while the eleventh horn will 'surpass in evil' (v 24, ὑπεροίσει κακοῦς) all the others. Although θ translates שְׁנִיָּה in v 19 with διάφορον, the variation at both instances of שְׁנִיָּה in vv 23f suggests an interpretation of the nature of the difference. However, the possibility that Theodotion is working from a different *Vorlage* must be admitted. On this occasion his rendering of the MT verbs differs from the Septuagint, yet the inclusion of κακοῦς as a plus against the Masoretic Text is in line with a similar plus in Θ.

## APPENDIX TWO

### SEPTUAGINT DANIEL 2-7 IN ENGLISH

What follows is an English translation of the Rahlfs edition of  $\mathfrak{G}$  Daniel 2-7. Its purpose is to assist in the comparison of  $\mathfrak{G}$  with MT by representing as closely as possible in English the syntactical relationships and vocabulary of the Greek. It strives to be as literal as it can be without distorting the sense of the Greek or producing meaningless English. Stylish English is not an aim. To that end, a one to one equivalence of vocabulary is sought for verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs. Footnotes indicate where that cannot be achieved. Greek word order is also represented wherever possible. Syntactical relationships are preserved in English, except that participles are often best rendered with finite verbs, and an active form of the verb in Greek is commonly expressed in English with a passive. I do not try for exact equivalence with particles and prepositions, but vary the translation of them according to context. Ambiguous Greek is allowed to remain ambiguous in the English.  $\text{K}\alpha\iota$  and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  remain as 'and' or 'but' and are not interpreted. Words in brackets represent either an English addition or a Greek element not represented in the translation.

#### **Daniel 2**

- 2.1 And in the second year of the reign<sup>1</sup> of Nebuchadnezzar, it happened that the king fell into visions and dreams and was frightened in his dream, and his sleep went from him.
- 2.2 And the king ordered to be brought in the magicians and enchanterers

---

<sup>1</sup>Also translated as 'kingdom'.

- and sorcerers of the Chaldeans to report his dreams to the king, and they came<sup>2</sup> and stood before the king.
- 2.3 And the king said<sup>3</sup> to them: I have seen a dream and my spirit was shaken.<sup>4</sup> Therefore I want to find out the dream.
- 2.4 And the Chaldeans spoke to the king in Syrian: Lord King, live forever. Report your dream to your servants<sup>5</sup> and we will tell<sup>6</sup> its interpretation.<sup>7</sup>
- 2.5 But the king answered and said to the Chaldeans: If you do not announce to me in truth the dream and explain to me its interpretation, you will be made an example of and your possessions will be taken into the king's treasury.
- 2.6 But if you make clear the dream to me and report its interpretation, you will acquire<sup>8</sup> gifts of all sorts and will be glorified by me. Explain to me the dream and interpret.<sup>9</sup>
- 2.7 But they answered a second time and said: O King, tell the vision and your servants will interpret it.
- 2.8 And the king said to them: In truth I know that you are buying time because you have seen that the matter<sup>10</sup> has gone out<sup>11</sup> from me. Therefore as I have commanded, so shall it be.
- 2.9 If you do not announce the dream to me in truth and explain its

---

<sup>2</sup>Greek participles are translated with a finite verb when their mood is more appropriately expressed in English as indicative.

<sup>3</sup>Εἶπον and λέγω are treated as synonymous. They are translated with 'say' or 'tell' or occasionally 'speak'. Εἶπον is also translated with 'order' when the sense demands, but 'order' usually is reserved for ἐπιτάσσω.

<sup>4</sup>Also translated as 'move'.

<sup>5</sup>Both παῖς and δοῦλος are translated as 'servant'.

<sup>6</sup>A translation of φράσω, which only appears here.

<sup>7</sup>'Interpretation' and 'judgement' translate κρῖμα and κρίσις, as well as the forms of both prefixed by συγ-.

<sup>8</sup>Also translated as 'seize'.

<sup>9</sup>Also translated as 'pronounce'.

<sup>10</sup>Translation of πρᾶγμα oscillates between 'matter' and 'affair'.

<sup>11</sup>Also translated as 'rebel', 'withdraw' and 'leave'.

interpretation, you will be put to death. For you have agreed to make lying words<sup>12</sup> to me until the time changes.<sup>13</sup> Now then, if you tell me the word that I saw<sup>14</sup> by night I will know that you will also explain its interpretation.

- 2.10 And the Chaldeans answered the king: Nobody on earth is able to tell the king what he saw, as you are asking, and no king and no power ever asks such a matter of a wise man or enchanter or Chaldean.
- 2.11 And the word that you seek, O king, is deep and awesome, and there is nobody who will explain this to the king except an angel, whose habitation is not with any flesh. Such a one is not found anywhere.
- 2.12 Then the king became sad and in great sorrow commanded all the wise men of Babylon to be led out.<sup>15</sup>
- 2.13 And it was decreed to kill them all, and Daniel was sought and all those with him for the sake of destroying (them) together.
- 2.14 Then Daniel spoke with the good counsel<sup>16</sup> and resolution which he had, to Arioch, chief of the king's bodyguard, who had been commanded to lead out the wise men of Babylon.
- 2.15 And he enquired of him and said: Why is it harshly decreed by the king? Then Arioch intimated the command to Daniel.
- 2.16 And Daniel went quickly into the king and petitioned that time might be given him by the king, and he would explain everything to the king.
- 2.17 Then Daniel went away to his house and showed everything to Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, the companions.
- 2.18 And he declared a fast and prayers (and) to seek help from the Lord Most High concerning this secret, lest Daniel and those with him be

---

<sup>12</sup>'Word' translates both ῥῆμα and λόγος.

<sup>13</sup>Also translated as 'affect'.

<sup>14</sup>'See' and 'look' both translate ὁράω, which is also treated as synonymous with εἶδω.

<sup>15</sup>Where the active form of a verb seems to carry a passive sense, it is translated with a passive. This is true especially of the Aramaic active impersonal often represented in the Greek.

<sup>16</sup>Also translated as 'plot'.

given over to destruction along with the wise men of Babylon.

- 2.19 Then to Daniel in a vision that very night was the secret of the king made clearly manifest. Then Daniel blessed the Lord Most High.
- 2.20 And he spoke up and said: The name of the great Lord shall be blessed forever, for wisdom and greatness are his.
- 2.21 And he changes seasons and times,<sup>17</sup> removes kings and sets (them) up, gives wisdom to the wise and insight to those who are learned,
- 2.22 reveals the deep things and dark things, and knows what is in the darkness and in the light, and puts an end to it.
- 2.23 To you, Lord of my fathers, I confess and praise, for you have given me wisdom and prudence, and now you have intimated to me the thing I petitioned you to explain to the king.
- 2.24 And Daniel went in to Arioch, who had been appointed<sup>18</sup> by the king to kill all the wise men of Babylon, and said to him: Do not destroy the wise men of Babylon, but take me in to the king, and I will explain everything to the king.
- 2.25 Then Arioch in haste took Daniel in to the king and said to him: I have found a wise man from the captivity of the sons of Judea who will explain everything to the king.
- 2.26 And the king answered and said to Daniel, who was also called in Chaldean Balthasar: Are you able to explain to me the vision which I saw and its interpretation?
- 2.27 And Daniel spoke up and said to the king: (As for) the secret which the king saw, not of wise men or sorcerers or magicians or diviners is the explanation.
- 2.28 But there is a God in heaven who reveals secrets, who has explained to King Nebuchadnezzar what must happen at the last days. O King, live forever. The dream and the vision of your head upon your bed is this:
- 2.29 You, O King, lay upon your bed and saw everything which must happen

---

<sup>17</sup> χρόνος and καιρός are both translated as 'time' except when they occur in this hendiadys. Then they are distinguished by translating the latter as 'season'.

<sup>18</sup> καθίστημι is normally translated as 'set up', a phrase that reflects the two senses of 'erect' and 'promote' which are present in the single Greek word. ἵστημι is also translated with 'set up' as well as 'stand'.



- at the last days, and the one who reveals secrets explained to you what must happen.
- 2.30 But not by a wisdom which is in me above all men was this secret made manifest to me, but for the sake of it being explained to the king, it was intimated to me what you came upon<sup>19</sup> in your heart in knowledge.
- 2.31 And you, O King, saw and behold: One image and that image was exceedingly great and its surpassing appearance stood before you, and the appearance of the image was frightening.
- 2.32 And its head was of pure gold, the chest and arms silver, the belly and thighs bronze,
- 2.33 and the legs iron, the feet partly iron and partly earthenware.
- 2.34 You looked until a stone was cut from a mountain without hands, and it struck the image upon the iron and earthenware feet and ground them down.
- 2.35 Then the iron and earthenware and gold and silver and bronze were ground together<sup>20</sup> and became like very fine chaff on the threshing floor, and the wind cast them out so that nothing was left of them. And the stone which struck the image became a great mountain and struck all the earth.
- 2.36 This is the vision and we will also tell the interpretation to the king.
- 2.37 You, O King, are king of kings and to you the Lord of heaven has given rule and kingdom and might and honour and glory
- 2.38 in all the inhabited world of men, and beasts of the field and birds of heaven and fish of the sea has he given over into your hand to be lord of them all. You are the head of gold.
- 2.39 And after you will arise a kingdom inferior to you, and another third bronze kingdom which will be lord over all the earth,
- 2.40 and a fourth kingdom mighty as iron which overpowers everything and hews down every tree, and all the earth will be shaken.
- 2.41 And as you saw its feet partly of potter's earthenware and partly of iron, the other kingdom will be divided in itself, since you saw the iron mixed together with the earthenware pottery.

---

<sup>19</sup>Also translated as 'respond'.

<sup>20</sup>Literally 'became together'.

- 2.42 And (as you saw) the toes of the feet partly of iron and partly of earthenware, part of the kingdom will be mighty and part will be shattered.
- 2.43 And as you saw the iron mixed together with the earthenware pottery, there will be mingling in the races of men but they will not be in harmony nor well-disposed to one another, just as iron cannot be blended with earthenware.
- 2.44 And in the times of these kings the God of heaven will set up another kingdom which will be forever and will not be ruined, and this kingdom will never belong to another nation, but it will strike and do away with these kingdoms and it will be set up forever,
- 2.45 even as you saw a stone cut from a mountain without hands and it smashed the earthenware, the iron and the bronze and the silver and the gold. The great God has intimated to the king what will be at the last days, and the vision is accurate and this interpretation trustworthy.
- 2.46 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king fell on his face on the ground and worshipped<sup>21</sup> Daniel, and ordered sacrifices and drink offerings to be made to him.
- 2.47 And the king spoke up and said to Daniel: In truth is your God the God of gods and the Lord of kings, who alone makes manifest hidden secrets, for you were enabled to explain this secret.
- 2.48 Then King Nebuchadnezzar extolled Daniel and gave him great and many gifts and set him up over the affairs of Babylon, and brought him forward as ruler and leader of all the Babylonian wise men.
- 2.49 And Daniel petitioned the king that Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego be set up over the affairs of Babylon, and Daniel was in the royal court.

### Daniel 3

- 3.1 In the eighteenth year Nebuchadnezzar the king, who administered cities and regions and all those inhabiting the earth from India to Ethiopia, made a golden image, its height 60 cubits and its breadth

---

<sup>21</sup>'Worship' translates both προσκυνέω and σέβομαι.

- 6 cubits, and he set it up on the plain around the region of Babylon.
- 3.2 And Nebuchadnezzar, king of kings and lord of the whole inhabited world, sent to be gathered all the peoples and tribes and tongues,<sup>22</sup> satraps, prefects, governors and courtiers, administrators and all those in authority over the region and over the whole inhabited world, to come to the dedication of the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king set up.
- 3.3 And the aforementioned stood before the image.
- 3.4 And the herald proclaimed to the crowd: It is declared to you, O nations and regions, peoples and tongues,
- 3.5 when you hear the sound<sup>23</sup> of the horn, pipe and zither, trigon and harp, bagpipes and all kinds of music, you will fall down and worship the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king set up.
- 3.6 And anyone who does not fall down and worship will be thrown into the furnace of fire which burns.<sup>24</sup>
- 3.7 And at that time when all the nations heard the sound of the horn and all the sounding of music, all the nations, tribes and tongues fell and worshipped the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar set up, in front of it (the image).
- 3.8 At that time Chaldean men approached and slandered the Judeans
- 3.9 and responded and said: O Lord King, live forever.
- 3.10 You, O king, commanded and pronounced that any man who hears the sound of the pipe and all the sounding of music should fall down and worship the golden image,
- 3.11 and whoever does not fall down and worship will be thrown into the furnace of fire which burns.
- 3.12 There are certain Judean men whom you set up over the region of Babylon: Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego. These men did not fear your commandment, and your idol they did not serve<sup>25</sup> and your golden image which you set up they did not worship.

---

<sup>22</sup>Also translated as 'speech'.

<sup>23</sup>Also translated as 'voice'.

<sup>24</sup>Also translated as 'heat'.

<sup>25</sup>'Serve' translates both λατρεύω and δουλεύω.

- 3.13 Then Nebuchadnezzar, furious with anger, commanded Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego to be brought.<sup>26</sup> Then the men were brought to the king.
- 3.14 And when Nebuchadnezzar the king glanced over at them he said: Why, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, do you not serve my gods, and the golden image which I set up not worship?
- 3.15 And now if you are ready, upon hearing the horn and all the sounding of music, to fall and worship the golden image which I set up.... But if not, know that when you do not worship you will immediately be thrown into the furnace of fire which burns. And what sort of God will rescue<sup>27</sup> you from my hand?
- 3.16 But Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego answered and said to King Nebuchadnezzar: O King, we have no need concerning this command to answer,
- 3.17 for there is one God in the heavens, our Lord whom we fear, who is able to rescue us out of the furnace of fire, and out of your hand, O King, he will rescue us.
- 3.18 And then it will be plain to you that we neither serve your idol nor your golden image which you set up do we worship.
- 3.19 Then Nebuchadnezzar was filled with fury and the form of his face changed, and he ordered the furnace to be heated seven times more than it was necessary to be heated.
- 3.20 And he ordered the most mighty men in the army<sup>28</sup> to bind Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego hand and foot and throw (them) into the furnace of fire which burns.
- 3.21 Then these men were bound, having their shoes (on) and (with) their hats upon their heads (and) with their clothing, and they were thrown into the furnace.
- 3.22 Seeing that the command of the king was pressing and the furnace heated seven times more than before, and the hand-picked men had bound them hand and foot and carried them up to the furnace and thrown them into it,

---

<sup>26</sup>Both φέρω and ἄγω are translated as 'bring'.

<sup>27</sup>Also translated as 'take away'.

<sup>28</sup>Also translated as 'host' or 'power'.

- 3.23 then the flame came out of the blazing furnace and killed the men who had bound those with Azariah, but they were kept (from harm).
- 3.24 Then Hananiah and Azariah and Mishael prayed<sup>29</sup> and sang praises to the Lord thus, for the king had commanded them to be thrown into the furnace.
- 3.25 And Azariah stood and prayed thus and opened his mouth and confessed to the Lord, together with his companions in the midst of the fire of the furnace excessively heated by the Chaldeans, and they said thus:
- 3.26 Blessed are you, Lord, the God of our fathers, and your name is praiseworthy and glorified forever,
- 3.27 for you are righteous in all that you have done, and all your works are true and your ways straight and all your judgements true.
- 3.28 And you have made a judgement of truth by all that you have brought upon us and upon your holy city of our fathers, Jerusalem, for you have done all these things in truth and justice because of our sins.
- 3.29 For we have sinned in everything and broken the law to rebel against you, and we have erred in everything and the commandments of your law we have not obeyed,
- 3.30 nor have we kept (them) nor have we done as we have been enjoined to that it might be well for us.
- 3.31 And now everything that you have brought upon us and everything that you have done to us, you have done in true judgement.
- 3.32 And you have given us over into the hands of our enemies, lawless and hated rebels, and to a king unrighteous and the most evil in all the earth.
- 3.33 And now it is not for us to open the mouth. Shame and contempt have come upon your servants and those who worship you.
- 3.34 Do not give us over to the end<sup>30</sup> because of your name and do not annul your covenant.
- 3.35 And do not withdraw your mercy from us, because of Abram who was

---

<sup>29</sup>Προσεύχομαι and δέομαι with its cognate noun are both translated as 'pray'. An exception is when the two occur as a hendiadys, in which case the latter term is translated as 'plead'.

<sup>30</sup>'End' translates both τέλος and πέρας.

- beloved by you and because of Isaac your servant and Israel your holy one,
- 3.36 to whom you spoke and told them to multiply their seed as the stars of heaven and as the sand by the shore of the sea.
- 3.37 For, Master, we have been made the smallest of all the nations, and we are the humblest in all the earth today because of our sins.
- 3.38 And there is not at this time ruler and prophet, nor leader nor burnt offering nor sacrifice nor offering nor incense, nor a place to offer first fruits before you and find mercy.
- 3.39 But in shattered soul and humbled spirit may we be accepted<sup>31</sup> as with burnt offerings of rams and bullocks and as with myriads of fat lambs.
- 3.40 Thus may our sacrifice come before you today and appease you, for there is no shame for those who have relied on you and make atonement<sup>32</sup> before you.
- 3.41 And now we follow you with our whole heart and we fear you and we seek your face. Do not put us to shame,
- 3.42 but do with us according to your clemency and according to the fulness of your mercy,
- 3.43 and rescue us by your marvelous deeds and give glory to your name, Lord.
- 3.44 And let all those who exhibit evil against your servants be rebuked and let them be put to shame by all the powers and let their might be shattered.
- 3.45 Let them know that you alone are the Lord God and esteemed over the whole inhabited world.
- 3.46 And the labourers of the king who threw them in did not leave off heating the furnace. And when at first they threw the three into the furnace, the furnace was red-hot because of its seven-fold intensity. And when they were thrown in, the ones who threw them in were above them and the ones underneath them stoked naphthah and tow and pitch and faggots.
- 3.47 And the flame leapt out above the furnace to 49 cubits,
- 3.48 and it spread out and burnt those of the Chaldeans found near the

---

<sup>31</sup>Also translated as 'wait'.

<sup>32</sup>See Moore, 59, on the textual difficulties in this verse.



furnace.

- 3.49 But an angel of the Lord came down at once to the aid of those with Azariah into the furnace, and scattered the flames of fire out of the furnace,
- 3.50 and made the midst of the furnace as a moist wind whistling, and the fire did not reach them at all, and it did not distress and did not trouble them.
- 3.51 But the three as out of one mouth took up a song of praise, and glorified and blessed and exalted God in the furnace saying:
- 3.52 Blessed are you, Lord, the God of our fathers, and praised and highly exalted forever, and blessed is the holy name of your glory and greatly praised and highly exalted for all ages.
- 3.53 Blessed are you in the temple of your holy glory and greatly praised and highly esteemed forever.
- 3.54 Blessed are you on the throne of your kingdom and praised and highly exalted forever.
- 3.55 Blessed are you who sees the abyss while seated upon the cherubim, and praised and glorified forever.
- 3.56 Blessed are you in the firmament and praised and glorified forever.
- 3.57 Bless the Lord, all the works of the Lord. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.58 Bless the Lord, angels of the Lord. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.59 Bless the Lord, heavens. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.60 Bless the Lord, all waters above the heaven. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.61 Bless the Lord, all the hosts of the Lord. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.62 Bless the Lord, sun and moon. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.63 Bless the Lord, stars of heaven. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.64 Bless the Lord, all rain and dew. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.65 Bless the Lord, all the winds. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.66 Bless the Lord, fire and heat. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.

- 3.67 Bless the Lord, frost and cold. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.68 Bless the Lord, dews and falling snow. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.69 Bless the Lord, ice and cold. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.70 Bless the Lord, rime and snow. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.71 Bless the Lord, nights and days. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.72 Bless the Lord, light and darkness. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.73 Bless the Lord, lightnings and clouds. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.74 Let the earth bless the Lord. Let it sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.75 Bless the Lord, mountains and hills. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.76 Bless the Lord, all that springs forth from the earth. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.77 Bless the Lord, springs. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.78 Bless the Lord, seas and rivers. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.79 Bless the Lord, whales and all that move in the waters. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.80 Bless the Lord, all birds of heaven. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.81 Bless the Lord, quadrupeds and beasts of the earth. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.82 Bless the Lord, sons of men. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.83 Bless the Lord, Israel. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.84 Bless the Lord, priests. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.85 Bless the Lord, servants. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.86 Bless the Lord, those of righteous spirit and soul. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever.
- 3.87 Bless the Lord, devout and humble in heart. Sing praise and highly

- exalt him forever.
- 3.88 Bless the Lord, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael. Sing praise and highly exalt him forever, for he has rescued us out of Hades and saved us out of the hand of death and delivered us out of the midst of the burning flame and redeemed us out of the fire.
- 3.89 Confess to the Lord for he is deserving, for his mercy is forever.
- 3.90 Bless, all who worship the God of gods. Sing praise and confess for his mercy is forever and forever and ever.
- 3.91 And when the king heard them singing praises he stood up and saw them living. Then Nebuchadnezzar the king marvelled and arose in haste and said to his friends:
- 3.92 Behold I see four men loose walking around in the fire and no ruination has come to them, and the sight of the fourth is like an angel of God.
- 3.93 And the king approached the door of the furnace of burning fire and called them by name: Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, servants of the Most High God of gods, come out of the fire. Accordingly, the men came out of the midst of the fire.
- 3.94 And the courtiers, governors and hereditary leaders and friends of the king gathered round and saw these men, that the fire had not reached their bodies and their hair was not scorched and their garments<sup>33</sup> were not affected, nor was the smell of fire on them.
- 3.95 And Nebuchadnezzar the king responded and said: Blessed be the Lord the God of Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, who sent his angel and saved his servants who put their hope in him, for they disregarded the command of the king and gave over their bodies to be set on fire that they might not serve or worship another god than their God.
- 3.96 And now I pronounce that every nation and all tribes and all tongues, whoever should blaspheme the Lord the God of Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, will be dismembered and his house confiscated, for there is no other god who is able to rescue thus.
- 3.97 So then the king gave authority to Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and set them up as rulers over the whole region.

---

<sup>33</sup>Literally 'trousers'.

## Daniel 4

- 4.4 In the eighteenth year of King Nebuchadnezzar, he said: We were at peace in my house and thriving upon my throne.
- 4.5 I saw a dream, and I was awe-struck and fear fell upon me.
- 4.10 I slept and behold: A high tree (was) growing upon the earth. The sight of it was great, and there was not another like it.
- 4.12 Its branches were thirty stadia in length and it cast a shadow over all the beasts of the earth under it, and in it the birds of heaven nested. Its fruit was plentiful and good and supplied all living things.
- 4.11 And the sight of it was great. Its crown drew near to heaven and its trunk to the clouds, filling everything under heaven. The sun and moon dwelt in it and it lit all the earth.
- 4.13 I looked in my sleep and behold: An angel was sent in might out of heaven.
- 4.14 And he shouted and said to him: Hew it down and annihilate<sup>34</sup> it, for it has been commanded from on high to uproot and disable it.
- 4.15 And say thus: Leave one of its roots in the earth, so that with the beasts of the earth on the hills he will be fed grass as the cattle.
- 4.16 And let his body be changed by the dew of heaven, and for seven years let him be grazed with them,
- 4.17 until he knows the Lord of heaven has authority over everything in heaven and on earth, and whatever he wants he does among them.
- 4.17a It was hewn down before me in one day and its annihilation (took place) in one moment of the day and its branches were given over to every wind and it was dragged about and cast out. And he ate the grass of the earth with the beasts of the earth, and was given over to the guard and in bronze fetters and handcuffs he was bound by them. I marvelled greatly at all these things and my sleep left my eyes.
- 4.18 And I arose early from my bed and called Daniel, ruler of the wise men and leader of the interpreters of dreams, and told the dream to him in full. And he showed me its whole interpretation.

---

<sup>34</sup>The unprefixd form of φθείρω is also translated as 'annihilate'.

- 4.19 And Daniel marvelled greatly and the true meaning<sup>35</sup> dismayed him, and fearful trembling seized him and the sight of him changed and his head shook for a moment. And he wondered and answered me with a soft voice: O King, let this dream come upon those who hate you, and its interpretation upon your enemies.
- 4.20 The tree planted in the earth, the sight of which was great: You are it, O King.
- 4.21 And all the birds of heaven nesting in it are the might of the earth and of the nations and of all tongues unto the ends of the earth. And all regions serve you.
- 4.22 And as that tree was lifted up and drew near to heaven and its trunk reached the clouds: You, O King, were exalted over all men who were upon the face of all the earth, (and) your heart was exalted in arrogance and might towards the Holy One and his angels. Your works were seen, how you desolated the house of the living God because of the sins of the consecrated people.
- 4.23 And the vision which you saw, that an angel was sent in might from the Lord, and that he said to raise up the tree and hew it down: The judgement of the great God will come upon you,
- 4.24 and the Most High and his angels are pursuing you.
- 4.25 And they will lead you away to prison and they will send you into a desert place.
- 4.26 And the root of the tree which is reserved, since it was not uprooted: The place of your throne will be kept for you until a time and a moment. Behold: against you are they preparing, and they will flog you and they will bring on what has been judged against you.
- 4.27 The Lord lives in heaven and his authority is over all the earth. Pray to him concerning your sins and redeem all your unrighteousness by acts of mercy, so that he might give clemency to you and (let you) be upon the throne of your kingdom for many days, and not annihilate you. Accept these words for my word is accurate and your time is fulfilled.<sup>36</sup>
- 4.28 And upon the completion of the words Nebuchadnezzar, who heard the

---

<sup>35</sup>Also translated as 'fancies'.

<sup>36</sup>Literally 'full'.

- interpretation of the vision, kept the words in the heart.
- 4.29 And after twelve months, the king was walking upon the walls of the city in all his glory, and going about upon its ramparts.
- 4.30 And he answered and said: This is Babylon the great which I have built, and my royal house is famous by my strong might for the honour of my glory.
- 4.31 And at the completion of his word he heard a voice from heaven: It is said to you, King Nebuchadnezzar, the kingdom of Babylon is taken from you and given to another, to a man of no account in your house. Behold: I am setting him up over your kingdom and he will receive your authority and your glory and your luxury, so that you might find out that the God of heaven has authority in the kingdom of men, and to whomever he wishes he gives it. Until sunrise another king will make merry in your house, and will gain possession of your majesty and your might and your authority.
- 4.32 And the angels will drive you away for seven years and you will not see, neither will you speak with, any man. You will be nourished with grass as the cattle and your food will be the green plants of the earth. Behold: Instead of your glory you will be bound, and another will have your house of luxury and your kingdom.
- 4.33 But soon everything will be accomplished upon you, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and it will not fall short of any of these things.
- 4.33a I, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, was bound up for seven years. I was nourished with grass as the cattle and I ate of the green plants of the earth. And after seven years I gave my soul to prayer and I petitioned concerning my sins before the face of the Lord, the God of heaven, and about my ignorance of the great God of gods I prayed.
- 4.33b And my nails became as the feathers of an eagle, my hair as a lion. My flesh was changed, as well as my heart. I went about naked with the beasts of the earth. I saw a dream and fancies seized me, and much sleep seized me for a time and drowsiness fell upon me.
- 4.34 And upon the completion of the seven years my time of redemption came and my sins and my ignorance were paid in full<sup>37</sup> before the God of heaven. And I prayed about my ignorance of the great God of

---

<sup>37</sup>Literally 'filled' or 'fulfilled'.



gods. And behold: An angel called to me out of heaven and said: Nebuchadnezzar, serve the holy God of heaven and give glory to the Most High. The throne of your nation he is giving back to you.

- 4.36 At that time my kingdom was restored to me and my glory given back to me.
- 4.37 I acknowledge the Most High and praise the creator of heaven and earth and the sea and the rivers and all that are in them. I confess and praise, for he is God of gods and Lord of lords and King of kings, for he does signs and wonders and changes seasons and times. He takes away a kingdom from kings and sets up others in their place.
- 4.37a From now I will serve him, and trembling from fear of him has seized me, and I will praise all his holy ones. For the gods of the nations do not have might in themselves to turn aside the kingdom of a king to another king, and to kill and to make alive, and to do signs and great marvels and fearful things and to change immensely great matters, such as the God of heaven has done in me and has changed great matters in me. All the days of my kingdom I will bring sacrifices for the sake of my soul to the Most High as a pleasing smell to the Lord, and I will do what is pleasing before him, I and my people, my nation and my regions under my authority. And whoever has spoken against the God of heaven, and whoever is left speaking thus, I will condemn him to death.
- 4.37b And King Nebuchadnezzar wrote an encyclical to the nations and regions and tongues in every place, to those who dwell in all the regions for generations and generations: Praise the Lord, the God of heaven, and offer sacrifices and offerings to him with esteem. I, king of kings, acknowledge him with esteem for he has done thus with me. In this day he seated me upon my throne and I gained possession of my authority and my rule among my people, and he restored my greatness to me.
- 4.37c King Nebuchadnezzar to all nations and all regions and all who dwell in them: Let peace be multiplied to you for all time. And now I will show you the works which the great God has done with me. For it has pleased me to bring before you and your wise men that God exists and his marvels are great, his kingdom is a kingdom forever, his authority from generation to generation. And he sent letters concerning everything which had happened to him in his

kingdom to all nations who were under his kingdom.

## Daniel 5

Abstract: Balthasar the king put on<sup>38</sup> a great reception on the day of the dedication of his kingdoms, and from among his nobles he called two thousand men. In that day Balthasar, lifted up by the wine and boastful,<sup>39</sup> drank to all the shaped and carved gods of the nations in his place, but to God Most High he did not give praise. On this night fingers came out as of a man and wrote on the wall of his house on the whitewash opposite the lamp-stand: Mene, peres, tekem. And their exposition is: Mene, counted; peres, taken away; tekem, set up.

- 5.1 Balthasar the king gave a great feast for his companions and drank wine.
- 5.2 And his heart was lifted up and he ordered the gold and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken from Jerusalem, to be brought and wine to be poured into them for his companions.
- 5.3 And it was brought and they drank from them.
- 5.4 And they blessed their idols made by hands, and they did not bless the eternal God who has authority over their spirit.
- 5.5 In that very moment fingers as of the hand of a man came out and wrote upon the wall of his house on the whitewash opposite the light in front of King Balthasar, and he saw the hand writing.
- 5.6 And the sight of him changed and fears and fancies dismayed him. Then the king hastened and rose from his seat and examined that writing, and the companions clamoured round him.
- 5.7 And the king shouted in a loud voice for the magicians and sorcerers and Chaldeans and diviners to be called, to announce the interpretation of the writing. And they came in as spectators to see the writing, and they were not able to provide the

---

<sup>38</sup>Literally 'made'.

<sup>39</sup>Also translated as 'clamour'.

interpretation<sup>40</sup> of the writing for the king. Then the king set forth a command and said: Any man who shows the interpretation of the writing, this purple robe and a gold necklace will be endowed on him, and authority over a third part of the kingdom will be given to him.

- 5.8 And the magicians and sorcerers and diviners came in, and none of them were able to announce the interpretation of the writing.
- 5.9 Then the king called the queen concerning the sign and showed her it, that it is great and that no man is able to announce the interpretation of the writing to the king.
- 5.10 Then the queen reminded him of Daniel who was from the captivity of Judea.
- 5.11 And she said to the king: The man was learned and wise and superior to all the wise men of Babylon,
- 5.12 and a holy spirit is in him, and in the days of your father the king he showed extraordinary interpretations to Nebuchadnezzar your father.
- 5.13 Then Daniel came in to the king, and the king answered and said to him:
- 5.16 O Daniel, are you able to show me the interpretation of the writing? And I will endow a purple robe and gold necklace upon you and you will have authority over a third part of my kingdom.
- 5.17 Then Daniel stood before the writing and read and answered thus to the king: This is the writing: counted, reckoned, taken away. And what is written by the hand stands. And this is their interpretation.
- 5.23 O king, you gave a great feast for your friends and drank wine, and the vessels of the house of the living God were brought to you and you drank from them, you and your nobles, and you praised all the idols made by hands of men. And you did not bless the living God, and your spirit is in his hand and he has given your kingdom to you, and you did not bless him or praise him.
- 5.26-28 This is the interpretation of the writing: The time of your kingdom is counted, your kingdom is ceasing, your kingdom is cut short and completed. It is given to the Medes and the Persians.

---

<sup>40</sup>Literally 'interpret the interpretation'.

- 5.29 Then Balthasar the king clothed Daniel in purple and endowed a gold necklace on him and gave authority to him over a third part of his kingdom.
- 5.30 And the interpretation came upon Balthasar the king, and the kingdom was taken away from the Chaldeans and given to the Medes and the Persians.

### Daniel 6

- 6.1 And Artaxerxes the Mede received the kingdom. And Darius was full of days and esteemed in old age.
- 6.2 And he set up 127 satraps over all his kingdom.
- 6.3 And over them three men were their leaders, and Daniel was one of the three men
- 6.4 who had authority over all in the kingdom. And Daniel was clothed in purple and (was) great and esteemed before Darius the king, for he was esteemed and learned and quick-witted and a holy spirit (was) in him, and he was successful in the king's business which he managed. Then the king wished to set up Daniel over all his kingdom, and the two men he had set up with him and the 127 satraps.
- 6.5 But when the king wished to set up Daniel over all his kingdom, (then) the two young men prepared a plot<sup>41</sup> and a resolution between themselves and said to one another: Since no sin or ignorance has been found against Daniel about which a complaint could be brought against him to the king...
- 6.6 And they said: Come, let us set up an injunction together that no man may make a petition<sup>42</sup> or pray a prayer<sup>43</sup> from any god for thirty days except by Darius the king. But if not, let him be executed. (This was) in order that they might give Daniel away before the king and he might be cast into the pit of lions. For they knew that Daniel prayed and pleaded with the Lord his God three times a

---

<sup>41</sup>Literally 'plotted a plot'. βουλεύω is normally translated as 'wish'.

<sup>42</sup>Literally 'petition petitions'.

<sup>43</sup>Προσεύχομαι and δέομαι are also translated as 'pray'.

day.

- 6.7 Then these men approached and spoke before the king:
- 6.8 We have set up an injunction and a statute that any man who prays a prayer or makes a petition by any god for thirty days except by Darius the king, will be cast into the pit of lions.
- 6.9 And they petitioned the king that he might set up the injunction and might not change it, for they knew that Daniel prayed and pleaded three times a day, so that he might be given away by the king and cast into the pit of lions.
- 6.10 And accordingly King Darius set up and ratified (it).
- 6.11 But Daniel found out about the injunction which he set up against him, and opened the windows in his upper room facing Jerusalem and fell on his face three times a day just as he had formerly done, and prayed.
- 6.12 And they watched Daniel and caught him praying three times a day each day.
- 6.13 Then these men met with the king and said: King Darius, did you not lay down an injunction that no man should either pray a prayer or make a petition by any god for thirty days except by you, O King, lest he be cast into the pit of lions? The king answered and said to them: The word is accurate and the injunction remains.
- 6.13a And they said to him: We swear to you by the decrees of the Medes and Persians lest you change the command or show favouritism,<sup>44</sup> and lest you detract from what has been said, and (that you) punish the man who has not upheld this injunction. And he said: I will do thus as you say, and this stands for me.
- 6.14 And they said: Behold: We have found Daniel your friend praying and pleading with the face of his god three times a day.
- 6.15 And in distress the king ordered Daniel to be cast into the pit of lions according to the injunction which he set up against him. Then the king was greatly distressed concerning Daniel, and strove to rescue him until the setting of the sun from the hands of the satraps.
- 6.16 And he was not able to rescue him from them.
- 6.17 But Darius the king cried out and said to Daniel: Your God whom

---

<sup>44</sup>Literally 'marvel at a face'.

- you serve constantly three times a day, he will rescue you from the hand of the lions. Have courage till morning.
- 6.18 Then Daniel was cast into the pit of lions, and a stone was brought and placed against the mouth of the pit, and the king sealed (it) with his own signet ring and with the signet rings of his nobles, lest Daniel be carried away<sup>45</sup> from them or the king draw him up out of the pit.
- 6.19 Then the king returned to his palace and lay down without eating and was distressed about Daniel. Then the God of Daniel brought to pass<sup>46</sup> what he had foreseen and closed the mouths of the lions, and they did not trouble Daniel.
- 6.20 And King Darius got up early in the morning and himself received the satraps, and went and stood at the mouth of the pit of lions.
- 6.21 Then the king called Daniel in a loud voice with weeping and said: O Daniel, are you still alive and has your God, whom you serve continually, saved you from the lions and have they not harmed you?
- 6.22 Then Daniel heard the loud voice and said: O King, I am still alive.
- 6.23 And God has saved me from the lions since righteousness before him was found in me, and also before you, O king, neither ignorance nor sin was found in me. But you listened to men leading kings astray and cast me into the pit of lions to destruction.
- 6.24 Then all the powers gathered round and saw Daniel whom the lions had not troubled.
- 6.25 Then these two men who had born witness against Daniel, they and their wives and their children, were cast to the lions and the lions killed them and crushed their bones.
- 6.26 Then Darius wrote to all the nations and regions and tongues, to those who dwell in all his land, and said:
- 6.27 All men who are in my kingdom shall stand worshipping and serving the God of Daniel, for he is a God who endures and lives from generation to generation forever.
- 6.28 I, Darius, will be worshipping and serving him all my days, for idols made by hands cannot save like the God of Daniel has redeemed

---

<sup>45</sup>Also translated as 'raise up' and 'pass away'.

<sup>46</sup>Literally 'made'.



Daniel.

- 6.29 And King Darius was gathered to his people<sup>47</sup> and Daniel was set up in the kingdom of Darius. And Cyrus the Persian received his kingdom.

## Daniel 7

- 7.1 In the first year of Balthasar's reigning in the region of Babylon, Daniel saw a vision of the head upon his bed. Then Daniel wrote the vision which he saw in the main points.<sup>48</sup>
- 7.2 Upon my bed I saw while asleep at night and behold: Four winds of heaven fell into the great sea.
- 7.3 And four beasts came up out of the sea, different one from the other.
- 7.4 The first (was) like a lion and had wings like an eagle. I looked until its wings were plucked and it was raised up from the earth and set up on human feet, and a human heart was given it.
- 7.5 And behold: With it another beast had the appearance of a bear, and it stood upon one side<sup>49</sup> and three ribs were in its mouth, and he spoke<sup>50</sup> thus: Arise, devour much flesh.
- 7.6 And after these things I saw another beast like a leopard, and four wings extended above it and four heads (belonged to) the beast, and speech was given to it.
- 7.7 And after these things I saw in a vision of the night a fourth fearful beast, and fear of it was surpassingly mighty. It had great iron teeth. It ate and pounded, it trampled round about with its feet, it behaved differently from all the beasts before it. And it had ten horns
- 7.8 and many plots in its horns. And behold: Another single horn grew up in their midst smaller among its horns, and three of the former

---

<sup>47</sup>This translation of γένοϋς is exceptional, in order to capture better a significant phrase.

<sup>48</sup>Literally 'words'.

<sup>49</sup>Literally 'rib'.

<sup>50</sup>A possible alternative is that the verb is passive in intent.

horns were withered by it. And behold: Eyes as human eyes were in this horn and a mouth speaking great things, and it made war against the holy ones.

- 7.9 I looked until thrones were placed and an ancient of days sat down, who had a garment as snow and the hair of his head as pure white wool. The throne (was) as a flame of fire
- 7.10 and from before him<sup>51</sup> went out a river of fire. Thousands of thousands attended on him and myriads of myriads stood by him. And the court sat and the books were opened.
- 7.11 I saw then the sound of the great words which the horn spoke, and the beast was beaten and its body destroyed and given into the heat of fire.
- 7.12 And he withdrew their authority from those round about him, and a time of life was given to them for a time and a season.
- 7.13 I saw in a vision of the night and behold: Upon the clouds of heaven one like a son of man came and one like an ancient of days was nearby, and those standing by drew close<sup>52</sup> to him.
- 7.14 And authority was given to him, and all the nations of the earth by generation and all glory are serving him. And his authority (is) an eternal authority which will never pass away, and his kingdom (which) will never be ruined.
- 7.15 And I, Daniel, was exhausted by these things in the vision of the night,
- 7.16 and approached one of those standing (by) and sought accuracy from him about all these things. And he answered and spoke to me and explained to me the interpretation of the words.
- 7.17 These great beasts are four kingdoms which will be destroyed from the earth.
- 7.18 And the holy ones of the Most High will receive the kingdom and they will occupy the kingdom forever and ever and ever.
- 7.19 Then I wanted to inquire closely about the fourth beast which was corrupting everything and (was) fearful, and behold: Its teeth (were) iron and its claws bronze. It devoured everything round about and trampled with feet.

---

<sup>51</sup>Literally 'from his face'.

<sup>52</sup>Translating προσήγαγον from P967.

- 7.20 And concerning its ten horns upon the head, and the other one which grew and three fell down before it, and that horn had eyes and a mouth speaking great things, and its appearance surpassed the others.
- 7.21 And that horn meant to join battle with the holy ones and put them to flight,
- 7.22 until came the Ancient of Days and gave judgement for the holy ones of the Most High. And the time was given and the holy ones took possession of the kingdom.
- 7.23 And he told me about the fourth beast: It will be a fourth kingdom on the earth which will be different from all the earth and will confuse it and grind it down.
- 7.24 And the ten horns of the kingdom: Ten kings will stand and the other king will stand after these, and he will be different in evil deeds from the first ones and will humble three kings.
- 7.25 And words against the Most High he will speak and the holy ones of the Most High he will exhaust, and he will wait<sup>53</sup> to change times and a law, and everything will be given over into his hand for a time and times and half a time.
- 7.26 And the court will sit and do away with the authority, and they will plot to pollute and destroy until the end.
- 7.27 And the kingdom and authority and their greatness and the rule of all kingdoms under heaven he will give to the holy people of the Most High to reign over an eternal kingdom, and all authorities will be subject to him and will be obedient to him.
- 7.28 Until the conclusion of the word I, Daniel, was overcome by great distraction and my state of mind altered (me) and I fixed the word in my heart.

---

<sup>53</sup>Also translated as 'accept'.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator', in C.E. Cox (ed), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 23-36
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Septuagintal Translation Techniques — A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 381-401
- Alt, A., 'Zur Menetekel-Inschrift', *VT* (1954), 303-305
- Alter, R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London / Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1981)
- Anderson, R.A., *Daniel, Signs and Wonders* (Grand Rapids / Edinburgh: Eerdmans / Handsel, 1984)
- Apocrypha*, New English Bible (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970)
- Archer, G.L., 'The Aramaic of the "Genesis Apocryphon" Compared with the Aramaic of Daniel', in J.B. Payne (ed), *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Waco: Word Books, 1970), 160-169
- Auerbach E. (tr W.R. Trask), *Mimesis, The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953)
- Auld, A.G. and C.Y.S. Ho, 'The Making of David and Goliath', *JSOT* 56 (1992), 19-39
- Avalos, H.I., 'The Comedic Function of the Enumerations of the Officials and Instruments in Daniel 3', *CBQ* 53 (1991), 580-588
- Babylonian Talmud*, ed I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1960-)
- Babylonian Talmud* (Hebrew-English Edition), ed I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1969)
- Baldwin, J.G., *Daniel* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978)
- Bar-Efrat, S., *Narrative Art in the Bible* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989)
- Barker, M., *The Older Testament* (London: SPCK, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Great Angel* (London: SPCK, 1992)
- Barr, J., *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979)
- Barthélemy, D., *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963)

- \_\_\_\_\_, D.W. Gooding, J. Lust, and E. Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath* (Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires, 1986)
- Barton, J., *Reading the Old Testament* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Oracles of God* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986)
- Bauer H. and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962)
- Beale, G.K., *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'A Reconsideration of the Text of Daniel in the Apocalypse', *Bib* 67 (1986), 539-543
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., 'The Interpretation of Daniel 7', *CBQ* 45 (1983), 44-58
- Beckwith, R.T., 'Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation', *RevQ* 10 (1979-81), 521-542
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (London: SPCK, 1986)
- Bennett, W.H., 'The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children', in R.H. Charles (ed), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 625-637
- Bensly R.L. (ed), 'The Fourth Book of Ezra', in J.A. Robinson (ed), *Texts and Studies III.2* (Cambridge: University Press, 1895)
- Bentzen, A., *Daniel* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1937)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *King and Messiah* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955)
- Berlin, A., *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983)
- Bevan, A.A., *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1892)
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1983)
- Bickerman, E., *Four Strange Books of the Bible* (New York: Schocken Books, 1967)
- Black, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- Blenkinsopp, J., 'Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History', in E.P. Sanders (ed), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2* (London: SCM Press, 1981), 1-26

- Bogaert, P.-M. 'Relecture et Refonte Historicisante du Livre de Daniel Attestés par la Première Version Grecque (Papyrus 967)', in R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser (eds), *Études sur le Judaïsme Hellénistique* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984), 197-224
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Daniel 3 LXX et Son Supplément Grec' (Unpublished paper presented to Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, 1991)
- Boogaart, T.A., 'Daniel 6: A Tale of Two Empires', *RR* 39 (1986), 106-112
- Booth, W.C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 1961)
- Brekelmans, C.H.W., 'The Saints of the Most High and Their Kingdom', *OTS* 14 (1965), 305-329
- Brenner, A., *The Israelite Woman* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985)
- Brock, S.P., 'The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity', in S. Jellicoe (ed), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 541-571
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 301-338
- Brown, F., S. Driver and C.A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MT: Hendrickson, 1979)
- Brown, R.E., 'The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of "Mystery"', *CBQ* 20 (1958), 417-443
- Bruce, F.F., 'The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation', *OTS* 17 (1972), 37-52
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Book Review of *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*', *CSR* 5 (1975), 199-201
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel', *OTS* 20 (1976), 22-40
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint', *BIOSCS* 12 (1979), 17-26
- Burton, E. de W., *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898)
- Busto Saiz, J.R., 'El Texto Teodocionico de Daniel y La Traducción de Simaco', *Sef* 40 (1980), 41-55
- Caird, G.B., *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980)
- Caquot, A., 'Sur les Quatre Bêtes de Daniel VII', *Semitica* 5 (1955), 5-13
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Les Quatre Bêtes et le "Fils d'Homme" (Daniel 7)', *Semitica* 17 (1967), 37-71



- Cardascia, G., 'L'Ordealie par le Fleuve dans les "Lois Assyriennes"', in G. Wiessner (ed), *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967), 19-36
- Casey, P.M., 'Porphyry and The Book of Daniel', *JTS* 27 (1976), 15-33
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1979)
- Cassin, E., 'Daniel dans la "fosse" aux Lions', *RHR* 139 (1951), 129-161
- Charles, R.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St John, I and II* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929)
- Charlesworth, J.H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, I and II* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983 / 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen / Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) / Westminster / John Knox, 1991)
- Clerget, J., 'L'Énigme et son Interprétation', *LV* 160 (1982), 36-47
- Clines, D.J.A., *The Esther Scroll* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984)
- Coggins, R., 'The Literary Approach to the Bible', *ExpT* 96 (1984), 9-14
- Colless, B.E., 'Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel', *JSOT* 56 (1992), 113-126
- Collins, J.J., 'The Symbolism of Transcendence in Jewish Apocalyptic', *BR* 19 (1974), 5-22
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Court-Tales in Daniel and The Development of Apocalyptic', *JBL* 94 (1975), 218-234
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Apocalyptic Vision of The Book of Daniel* (Ann Arbor: Scholars Press, 1977)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Daniel and His Social World', *Int* 39 (1985), 131-143
- Cook, E.M., '"In the Plain of the Wall" (Dan 3.1)', *JBL* 108 (1989), 115-116
- Coppens, J. and L. Dequeker, *Le Fils de l'Homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel VII* (Bruges / Paris: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1961)
- Cowe, S.P., *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992)
- Coxon, P.W., 'Daniel III 17: A Linguistic and Theological Problem', *VT* 26 (1976), 400-409

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of *Daniel*: A Dialectical Study', *HUCA* 48 (1977), 107-122
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Distribution of Synonyms in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of Official Aramaic and the Aramaic of Qumran', *RevQ* 9 (1978), 497-512
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'A Morphological Study of the *h*-Prefix in Biblical Aramaic', *JAOS* 98 (1978), 416-419
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations in Biblical Aramaic', *ZDMG* 129 (1979), 8-22
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The "List" Genre and Narrative Style in the Court Tales of *Daniel*', *JSOT* 35 (1986), 95-121
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Great Tree of *Daniel* 4', in J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (eds), *A Word in Season* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 91-111
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Another Look at Nebuchadnezzar's Madness' (Unpublished paper presented to Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, 1991)
- Croatto, J.S. (tr R.R. Barr), *Biblical Hermeneutics* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1987)
- Dalman, G., *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1894)
- Daubney, W.H., *The Three Additions of Daniel* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1906)
- David, P.A., *The Composition and Structure of the Book of Daniel: A Synchronic and Diachronic Reading* (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven: unpublished D.S.T. thesis, 1991)
- Davidson, A.B., *Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1989)
- Davidson, B., *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Peabody, MT: Hendrickson, 1981)
- Davidson, M.J., *Angels at Qumran, A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108, and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992)
- Davies, P.R., *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-140
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985)
- Delcor, M., 'Les Sources du Chapitre VII de *Daniel*', *VT* 18 (1968), 290-312
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Un cas de traduction "Targumique" de la LXX à propos de la statue en or de Dan III', *Textus* 7 (1969), 30-35

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Le Livre de Daniel* (Paris: Gabolda, 1971)
- Dequeker, L., 'The "Saints of the Most High" in Qumran and Daniel', *OTS* 18 (1973), 108-187
- Derrett, J.D.M., 'Daniel and Salvation History', in *Studies in the New Testament IV* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 132-137
- Dougherty, R.P., *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929)
- Driver, G.R. and J.C. Miles, *The Assyrian Laws* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935)
- Driver, S.R., *Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900)
- Eissfeldt, O., 'Die Menetekel-Inschrift und ihre Deutung', *ZAW* 63 (1951), 105-114
- Elliger, K., *Deuterocesaja*, 1 Tlb. *Jesaja* 40,1-45,7 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978)
- Emerton, J.A., 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery', *JTS* 9 (1958), 225-242
- Ferch, A.J., 'Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration', *JBL* 99 (1980), 75-86
- Feuillet, A., 'Le Fils de l'Homme de Daniel et la Tradition Biblique', *RB* 60 (1953), 170-202
- Fewell, D.N., *Circle of Sovereignty* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988)
- Finkel, A., 'The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures', *RevQ* 4 (1964), 357-370
- Fitzmyer, J.A., 'Some Observations on the *Genesis Apocryphon*', *CBQ* 22 (1960), 277-291
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990)
- Fox, M.V., *The Redaction of the Books of Esther* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991)
- Frei, H.W., *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 1974)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The "Literal Reading" of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does it Stretch or Will it Break?', in F. McConnell (ed), *The Bible and the Narrative Tradition* (Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 36-77

- Frye, N., *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971)
- Gallé, A.F. (tr), *Daniel avec Commentaires de R. Saadia, Aben-Ezra, Raschi, etc.* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1900)
- Gammie, J.G., 'Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature', *JBL* 93 (1974), 356-385
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel', *JBL* 95 (1976), 191-204
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'On The Intention and Sources of Daniel I-VI', *VT* 31 (1981), 282-292
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983)
- García Martínez, F., *Qumran and Apocalyptic, Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992)
- Gaster, M., 'The Unknown Aramaic Original of Theodotion's Additions to the Book of Daniel', *PSBA* 16 (1894), 280-290, 312-317, and *PSBA* 17 (1895), 75-94
- \_\_\_\_\_(ed), *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899)
- Geissen, A. (ed), *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 5-12 sowie Esther 1-2.15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1968)
- Genette, G. (tr J.E. Lewin), *Narrative Discourse* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980)
- Gershevitch, I., 'Zoroaster's Own Contribution', *JNES* 23 (1964), 12-38
- Gesenius, W., E. Kautzsch and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910)
- Gibson, J.C.L., *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions 2* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)
- Gilbert, M.P., 'La Prière d'Azarias', *NRT* 6 (1974), 561-582
- Gingrich, W.F., F.W. Danker and W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 1958)
- Goldingay, J.E., 'The Stories in Daniel: A Narrative Politics', *JSOT* 37 (1987), 99-116
- \_\_\_\_\_, '"Holy Ones on High" in Daniel 7:18', *JBL* 107 (1988), 495-497
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Dallas: Word Books, 1989)
- Good, E.M., *Irony in the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965)

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Apocalyptic as Comedy: The Book of Daniel', *Semeia* 32 (1984), 41-70
- Gooding, D.W., 'The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and its Implications', *TynB* 32 (1981), 43-79
- Goodwin, W.W., *Syntax of The Moods and Tenses of The Greek Verb* (London: MacMillan and Co, 1889)
- Green, G. (ed), *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987)
- Greenfield, J.C. and A. Shaffer, 'Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye', *Iraq* 45 (1983), 109-116
- Grelot, P., 'Les Versions Grecques de Daniel', *Bib* 47 (1966), 381-402
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'La Septante de Daniel IV et Son Substrat Sémitique', *RB* 81 (1974), 5-24
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Daniel VII,9-10 et le Livre d'Henoch', *Semitica* 28 (1978), 59-83
- Gunn, D.M., 'Reading Right, Reliable and Omniscient Narrator, Omniscient God, and Foolproof Composition in the Hebrew Bible', in D.J.A. Clines, S.E. Fowl and S.E. Porter (eds), *The Bible in Three Dimensions* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 53-64
- Hamm, W. (ed), *Der Septuagint-Text des Buches Daniel Kap 1-2 nach dem Teil des Papyrus 967* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Der Septuagint-Text des Buches Daniel Kap 3-4 nach dem Teil des Papyrus 967* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag GMBH, 1977)
- Hammer, R., *The Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976)
- Hanhart, R., 'The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 339-379
- Harrington, D.J. (ed), *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo* (Society of Biblical Literature, 1974)
- Hartman, L.F. and A.A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (New York: Doubleday and Co, 1978)
- Hasel, G.F., 'The Identity of "The Saints of the Most High" in Daniel 7', *Bib* 56 (1975), 173-192
- Hatch, E. and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897)
- Hayman, A.P., 'Qohelet and the Book of Creation', *JSOT* 50 (1991), 93-111
- Heaton, E.W., *The Book of Daniel* (London: SCM Press, 1956)

- Herodotus Vol I*, tr G. Rawlinson (London: John Murray, 1858)
- Hippolytus (tr S.D.F. Salmond), *The Writings of Hippolytus I* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1866)
- Holladay, W.L., *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971)
- Hooker, M.D., *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967)
- Horgan, M.P., *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979)
- Humphreys, W.L., 'A Lifestyle for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel', *JBL* 92 (1973), 211-223
- Jastrow, M., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York / Berlin: Verlag Choneb, 1926)
- Jeansonne, S.P., *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (Washington: CBQ Monograph 19, 1988)
- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Some Reflections on the καίγε Recension', *VT* 23 (1973), 15-24
- Jephet Ibn Ali (ed D.S. Margoliouth), *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889)
- Josephus (tr R. Marcus), *Jewish Antiquities* (Cambridge, MT / London: Harvard University Press / Heinemann, 1937)
- Kahle, P., *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959)
- Kaufmann, Y. (tr M. Greenberg), *The Religion of Israel* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1961)
- Keil, G.F. (tr M.G. Easton), *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872)
- Kenyon, F.C., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasciculus 12 (London: Emery Walker Ltd, 1937)
- Kitchen, K.A., 'The Aramaic of Daniel', in D.J. Wiseman et.al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965), 31-79
- Klein, R.W., *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974)
- Knibb, M.A., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)



- Koch, K., 'Die Weltreiche im Danielbuch', *TLZ* 85 (1960), 829-832
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Herkunft der Proto-Theodotion-Übersetzung des Danielbuches', *VT* 23 (1973), 362-365
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?' *Int* 39 (1985), 117-130
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon and Bercker, 1987)
- Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1953)
- van der Kooij, A., 'A Case of Reinterpretation in the Old Greek of Daniel 11', in J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge, P.T. van Rooden and J.W. Wesselius (eds), *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 72-80
- Kutscher, E.Y., *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977)
- Lacocque, A., *Le Livre de Daniel* (Paris: Delachaux and Niestle, 1976)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Apocalyptic Symbolism: A Ricoeurian Hermeneutical Approach', *BR* 26 (1981), 6-15
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel in His Time* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988)
- Lambert, W.G., 'Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice', *Iraq* 27 (1965), 1-11
- Lanser, S.S., *The Narrative Act* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)
- Lemke, W.E., 'Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant', *CBQ* 28 (1966), 45-50
- Lenglet, A., 'La Structure Littéraire de Daniel 2-7', *Bib* 53 (1972), 169-190
- Levinger, J., 'Daniel in the Lion's Den — A Model of National Literature of Struggle', *BM* 70 (1977), 329-333, 394f
- Lewy, J., 'The Late Assyro-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and Its Culmination at the Time of Nabonidus', *HUCA* 19 (1945-46), 405-489
- Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940)
- Lohse, E. (ed), *Die Texte aus Qumran* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971)
- Long, B.O. (ed), *Images of Man and God* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The "New" Biblical Poetics of Alter and Sternberg', *JSOT* 51 (1991), 71-84
- Longman, T., *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987)

- Lotman, J.M. (tr L.M. O'Toole), 'Point of View in a Text', *NLH* 6 (1975), 339-352
- Lucas, E.C., 'The Origin of Daniel's Four Empires Schemes Re-examined', *TynB* 40 (1989), 185-202
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Source of Daniel's Animal Imagery', *TynB* 41 (1990), 161-185
- Lust, J., 'Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint', *ETL* 54 (1978), 62-69
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4-5' (Unpublished paper presented to Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, 1991)
- Masson, E., *Recherches sur les Plus Anciens Emprunts Sémitique en Grec* (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1967)
- Mastin, B.A., 'Daniel 2.46 and the Hellenistic World', *ZAW* 85 (1973), 80-93
- Mayser, E., *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin / Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co, 1926)
- McComiskey, T.E., 'The Seventy "Weeks" of Daniel Against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Literature', *WTJ* 47 (1985), 18-45
- McCrystall, A.P.J., *Studies in the Old Greek Translation of Daniel* (Oxford University: unpublished D.Phil. thesis, 1980)
- McGaughey, D.R., 'Ricoeur's Metaphor and Narrative Theories as a Foundation for a Theory of Symbol', *RelSt* 24 (1988), 415-437
- McKane, W., 'Jeremiah 27.5-8, Especially "Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant"', in V. Fritz, K.-F. Pohlmann and H.-C. Schmitt (eds), *Prophet und Prophetenbuch* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 98-110
- McNamara, M., 'Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel', *ITQ* 37 (1970), 131-149
- Midrash Tanhuma*, ed M. Buber (Jerusalem: 1964)
- Milik, J.T., 'Prière de Nabonide', *RB* 63 (1956), 407-415
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa' *JJS* 23 (1972), 95-144
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Les Modèles Araméens du Livre d'Esther dans la Grotte 4 de Qumran' *RevQ* 15 (1991-1992), 321-407
- Millard, A.R., 'Daniel 1-6 and History', *EvQ* 49 (1977), 67-73
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Etymology of *Nebrasta*, Daniel 5:5', *Maarav* 4 (1987), 87-92
- Miller, J.E., 'The Redaction of Daniel', *JSOT* 52 (1991), 115-124
- Milne, P.J., *Vladimir Propp and the Study of Structure in Hebrew Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988)
- Miscall, P.D., *The Workings of Old Testament Narrative* (Philadelphia / Chico: Fortress Press / Scholars Press, 1983)

- Mitchell, T.C. and R. Joyce, 'Musical Instruments in Nebuchadnezzar's Orchestra', in D.J. Wiseman et.al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965), 19-27
- Moberly, R.W.L., 'Story in the Old Testament', *Them* 11 (1986), 77-82
- \_\_\_\_\_, *From Eden to Golgotha* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Genesis 12-50* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992)
- Montefiore, C.G. and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (London: MacMillan and Co, 1938)
- Montgomery, J.A., 'The "Two Youths" in the LXX to Dan 6', *JAOS* 41 (1921), 316-317
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927)
- de Moor, J.C., 'An Incantation Against Evil Spirits (Ras Ibn Hani 78/20)', *UF* 12 (1980), 429-432
- Moore, C.A., *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co, 1977)
- Mosca, P.G., 'Ugarit and Daniel 7: A Missing Link', *Bib* 67 (1986), 496-517
- Müller, H.-P., 'Mantische Weisheit und Apocalyptic', *VTS* 22 (1972), 268-293
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Märchen, Legende und Enderwartung', *VT* 26 (1976), 338-350
- Muraoka, T., 'Notes on the Syntax of Biblical Aramaic', *JSS* 11 (1966), 151-167
- Murray, R., 'The Origin of Aramaic 'ir, Angel', *Or* 53 (1984), 303-317
- Niditch, S., *The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and R. Doran, 'The Success Story of the Wise Courtier: A Formal Approach', *JBL* 96 (1977), 179-193
- Noth, M., 'Die hieligen des Höchsten', in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966), 274-290
- Oldenburg, U., *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969)
- Oppenheim, A.L., *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 1977)
- Paul, S., 'Daniel 3.29 — A Case Study of "Neglected" Blasphemy', *JNES* 42 (1983), 291-294
- Payne, J.B., 'The Goal of Daniel's Seventy Weeks', *JETS* 21 (1978), 97-115

- Perrin, N., 'Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Message of Jesus', in L.C. McGaughey (ed), *Proceedings 2* (Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 543-570
- Peters, J.P., 'Notes on the Old Testament', *JBL* 15 (1896), 106-117
- Plöger, O., *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965)
- Pope, M.H., *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955)
- Porteous, N.W., *Daniel* (London: SCM Press, 1965)
- Powell, M.A., *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990)
- Poythress, V.S., 'The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII', *VT* 26 (1976), 208-213
- Pritchard, J.B., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Ancient Near East in Pictures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954)
- Prickett, S., 'Poetics and Narrative, Biblical Criticism and the Nineteenth-Century Novel', in D. Jaspar and T.R. Wright (eds), *The Critical Spirit and the Will to Believe* (London: MacMillan Press, 1989), 1-24
- Raabe, P.R., 'Daniel 7: Its Structure and Role in the Book', *HAR* 9 (1985), 267-275
- Rabin, C., 'The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint', *Textus* 6 (1968), 1-26
- von Rad, G., *Wisdom in Israel* (London: SCM Press, 1970)
- Reeves, J., 'An Enochic Citation in Barnabas 4:3 and the Oracles of Hystaspes', (IOUDAIOS Electronic Bulletin Board: November 1992)
- Reid, S.B., *Enoch and Daniel, A Form Critical and Sociological Study of Historical Apocalypses* (Berkeley: BIBAL Press, 1989)
- Ricoeur, P., *Interpretation Theory* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976)
- Rosen, H.B., 'On the Use of the Tenses in the Aramaic of Daniel', *JSS* 6 (1961), 183-203
- Rosenthal, F., *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1968)
- Roth, W.M.W., 'For Life He Appeals to Death (Wis 13.18), A Study of Old Testament Idol Parodies', *CBQ* 37 (1975), 21-47
- Rothstein, W., 'Die Zusätze zu Daniel', in E. Kautzsch (ed), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen:

- J.C.B. Mohr, 1900), 172-192
- Rowley, H.H., 'The Unity of The Book of Daniel', in *The Servant of the Lord* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), 253-268
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959)
- Russell, D.S., *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1964)
- Sailhamer, J.H., *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41* (New York: Peter Lang, 1990)
- Saldarini, A.J., *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988)
- Sanders, B.G., 'The Burning Fiery Furnace', *Theology* 58 (1955), 340-345
- Savran, G., *Telling and Retelling, Quotation in Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington / Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988)
- Schaberg, J., 'Mark 14.62: Early Christian Merkabah Imagery?', in J. Marcus and M.L. Soards (eds), *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 69-94
- Schaeder, H.H., *Iranische Beiträge I* (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1930)
- Schmidt, N., 'Daniel and Androcles', *JAOS* 46 (1926), 1-7
- Schmitt, A., 'Die Griechischen Danieltexte ("θ" und ο) und das Theodotionproblem', *BZ* 36 (1992), 1-29
- Schurer, E. (ed G. Vermes, F. Miller and M. Goodman), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ III* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1986)
- Seeligmann, I.L., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948)
- Segal, M.H., *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927)
- Septuaginta*, ed A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952)
- Shea, W.H., 'Wrestling with the Prince of Persia: A Study on Daniel 10', *AUSS* 21 (1983), 225-250
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 5 and the Broader Relationships within Chapters 2-7', *AUSS* 23 (1985), 277-295
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Bel(te)shazzar Meets Belshazzar', *AUSS* 26 (1988), 67-81
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Darius the Mede', *AUSS* 29 (1991), 235-257
- Sheriffs, D.C.T., '"A Tale of Two Cities" — Nationalism in Zion and

- Babylon', *TynB* 39 (1988), 19-57
- Silberman, L.H., 'Unriddling the Riddle, A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habbakuk Peshar (1QpHab)', *RevQ* 3 (1961-1962), 326-364
- Simon, U., 'Minor Characters in Biblical Narrative', *JSOT* 46 (1990), 11-19
- Slotki, J.J., *Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah* (London: Soncino Press, 1951)
- Smith, M.S., 'The "Son of Man" in Ugaritic', *CBQ* 45 (1983), 59-60
- Stanzel, F.K. (tr C. Goedsche), *A Theory of Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- Stefanovic, Z., 'Thematic Links between the Historical and Prophetic Sections of Daniel', *AUSS* 27 (1989), 121-127
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Daniel: A Book of Significant Reversals', *AUSS* 30 (1992), 139-150
- Sternberg, M., 'Proteus in Quotation Land', *PT* 3 (1982), 107-156
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985)
- Stevenson, W.B., *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924)
- Stinespring, W.F., 'The Active Infinitive with Passive Meaning in Biblical Aramaic', *JBL* 81 (1962), 391-394
- Stuart, M., *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1850)
- Tcherikover V. (tr S. Applebaum), *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Atheneum, 1970)
- Thompson, T.L., *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987)
- Torrey, C.C., 'Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel', *TCAAS* 15 (1909), 241-282
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ezra Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910)
- Tov, E., 'Three Dimensions of LXX Words', *RB* 83 (1976), 529-544
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint', *Bib* 60 (1979), 216-236
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)', *ZAW* 91 (1979), 73-93



- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Text Critical use of The Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 1981)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?', in A. Piertsma and C. Cox (eds), *De Septuaginta* (Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1984), 53-70
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Unpublished Qumran Texts from Caves 4 and 11', *JJS* 43 (1992), 101-136
- Towner, W.S., 'Poetic Passages of Daniel 1-6', *CBQ* 31 (1969), 317-326
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984)
- Trudinger, L.P., 'Some Observations Concerning the Text of the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation', *JTS* 17 (1966), 82-88
- Ulrich, E., 'Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan-a', *BASOR* 268 (1987), 17-37
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan-b and 4QDan-c', *BASOR* 274 (1989), 3-26
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of their Value', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 49-80
- Vanderkam, J.C., *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984)
- Vermes, G., 'Appendix E: The Use of *בר נשא* / *בר נש* in Jewish Aramaic', in M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 310-328
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Qumran Forum Miscellanea I', *JJS* 43 (1992), 299-305
- de Vries, S.J., 'Observations on Quantitative and Qualitative Time in Wisdom and Apocalyptic', in J.G. Gammie, W.A. Brueggemann, W.L. Humphreys and J.M. Ward (eds), *Israelite Wisdom* (New York: Scholars Press, 1978), 263-276
- Walters, P. (ed D.W. Gooding), *The Text of the Septuagint* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973)
- Waltke, B.K. and M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990)
- Walton, J.H., 'The Decree of Darius the Mede in Daniel 6', *JETS* 31 (1988), 279-286
- Wesselius, J.W., 'Language and Style in Biblical Aramaic: Observations On The Unity of Daniel 2-6', *VT* 38 (1988), 194-209
- Wharton, J., 'Daniel 3.16-18', *Int* 39 (1985), 170-176
- Whitcomb, J.C., *Darius the Mede* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959)

- Whybray, R.N., *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974)
- Wills, L.M., *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990)
- Wilson, G.H., 'Wisdom in Daniel and the Origin of Apocalyptic', *HAR* 9 (1985), 373-381
- Wiseman, D.J., 'Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel', in D.J. Wiseman et al, *Notes on Some Problems in The Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965), 9-18
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)
- Wolters, A., 'Untying the King's knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5', *JBL* 110 (1991), 117-122
- van der Woude, A.S., 'Erwägungen zur Doppelsprachigkeit des Buches Daniel', in H.L.J. Vanstiphont, K. Jongeling, F. Leemhuis and G.J. Reinink (eds), *Scripta Signa Vocis* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1986), 305-316
- Wright, B.G., *No Small Difference, Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989)
- Würthwein, E., *The Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957)
- Wyatt, N., 'The Story of Dinah and Shechem', *UF* 22 (1990), 433-458
- Xenophon (tr W. Miller), *Cyropaedia I and II* (Cambridge / London: Harvard University Press / William Heinemann, 1914)
- Yamauchi, E.M., 'Daniel and Contacts Between the Aegean and the Near East Before Alexander', *EvQ* 53 (1981), 37-47
- Young, E.J., *Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man* (London: Tyndale Press, 1958)
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972)
- Zevit, Z., 'The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7', *ZAW* 80 (1968), 385-396
- Ziegler, J., *Septuaginta: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954)